

FBIS-SOV-87-099

Friday

22 May 1987

Vol III No 099

Daily Report

SOVIET UNION

SPECIAL CONSUMER NOTICE
PRINTED INSIDE COVER



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTICE

On 1 June 1987 FBIS will begin publication of reorganized and renamed DAILY REPORTS. The following list details the changes being made in the eight volumes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| I. CHINA DAILY REPORT | Contents unchanged |
| II. EASTERN EUROPE DAILY REPORT | Contents unchanged |
| III. SOVIET UNION DAILY REPORT | Contents unchanged |
| IV. EAST ASIA DAILY REPORT | Renamed; formerly ASIA & PACIFIC DAILY REPORT; contents unchanged |
| V. NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA DAILY REPORT | Renamed; formerly MIDDLE EAST & AFRICA DAILY REPORT; contents include:
Middle East & South Asia Review
Inter-Arab Affairs
Islamic Affairs
Palestinian Affairs
OPEC Affairs
South Asian Regional Affairs
Arab Africa
Algeria
Chad
Egypt
Libya
Mauritania
Morocco
Sudan
Tunisia
Western Sahara
Arabian Peninsula
Bahrain
Kuwait
Oman
PDRY
Qatar
Saudi Arabia
United Arab Emirates
Yemen Arab Republic
Iraq
Israel
Jordan
Lebanon
Syria
South Asia
Afghanistan
Bangladesh
India
Iran
Maldives
Nepal & Bhutan
Pakistan
Sri Lanka |
| VI. LATIN AMERICA DAILY REPORT | Contents unchanged |

(continued on back of report)

FBIS**DAILY REPORT
CONTENTS***Soviet Union*

Vol III No 099

22 May 1987

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Gerasimov Discusses Soviet-U.S. Ties, Arms Talks [Prague]	AA 1
Vorontsov Interviewed on Arms Talks, ABM [Sofia ZEMEDEL'SKO ZNAME 19 May]	AA 11
U.S. Conducts SDI Test, 'Destroying' ABM Treaty	AA 13
Pave Paws Radar Station Violates ABM Treaty [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 May]	AA 13
White House 'Secret' ABM Report Issued	AA 13
Chernyshev Views U.S. Opposition to ABM Treaty	AA 14
NEW TIMES Commentary [Korniyenko]	AA 16
Solton on Applying Disarmament Plan to Asia	AA 17

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Gremitskikh 21 May Foreign Ministry News Conference	CC 1
Shultz' Asia-Pacific Remarks	CC 1
Anti-Soviet Campaign in Japan	CC 2
Remarks on CSCE	CC 2
Denies Effort To Reunify Germany	CC 3
U.S. Warship Border Violation	CC 4
Correction To Pyadyshev's Remarks on ABM Treaty	CC 4

UNITED STATES & CANADA

'Discriminatory' Measure Taken Against Journalists	A 1
Moscow-Washington TV Link-Up Shown to Media	A 1
Naval Presence in Gulf To Be Preserved	A 2
Reagan, Pakistan's Yaqub Khan Discuss Military Aid	A 2

SOUTH ASIA

Mudslide Threatens Supply Link to Afghanistan [Leshchinskiy]	D 1
DRA Reconciliation Process Varies Within Provinces	D 1

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Thai Foreign Minister Speaks at 11 May Luncheon [Bangkok Voice of Free Asia]	E 1
Cambodian Leaders Cited on Reconciliation Hopes [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 May]	E 1
U.S. Involvement in PRK; Sihanouk 'Silent Protest'	E 3

EASTERN EUROPE

Sokolov, Karpati Address Joint Armed Forces Meeting F 1
PRAVDA Reports Honecker-Medvedev Meeting in Berlin F 1
[19 May]

WESTERN EUROPE

Further Reportage on Chirac Official Visit G 1
Chirac Sees Academy of Sciences G 1
Gorbachev Talks Demonstration [AFP] G 2
Gorbachev-Chirac Discuss Ties G 2
Development, Disarmament Viewed G 4
[Paris International]
More on Gorbachev-Chirac Talks [Paris] G 4
Chirac Meets Dissidents [AFP] G 5
Ariane Case 'Petition' G 6
Chirac Moscow TV Interview G 7
AFP on Coverage of Interview [AFP] G 14
TRUD Reports Danish Trade Unionists 4-7 May Visit G 14
[8 May]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Pogodin Warns of Possible Escalation in Gulf H 1
Abu Dhabi Paper: 'New Weapons' Promised to Syria H 1
[Abu Dhabi AL-ITTIHAD 20 May]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Moscow Comments on U.S.-Chile Relations [Correa] K 1

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

CPSU's Medvedev Addresses Workers in Baku R 1
[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 28 Apr]
Comparison: Leaders Punished for Baykal Pollution R 17
[PRAVDA 16 May]

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

CSA Updates Farm Produce Progress for 1st Quarter T 1
IZVESTIYA Examines Status of Feed Crop Cultivation T 1
[Gavrichkin 14 May]
Media Cover 17-18 May Agricultural Work T 3
CSA Reports T 4
Intensive Labor Collectives Get Good Results T 5
[IZVESTIYA 12 May]

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Cosmos-1846 Launched 21 May, Functioning Normally U 1
Academician Marchuk Discusses Rocket Energiya U 1

We are not against it. We want to see all nuclear weapons removed from the battlefields, but if we mix them all together now to one big heap, we will take a long time to sort them out. The result will be chaos. Everything has been mixed together in the house of the allies and now they point out that it is not necessary to hurry, but to study everything carefully -- to see that there is no trap. But actually, this is the zero option that they proposed in 1981.

[Presenter] A proposal from 1981. The Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles corresponds, in a certain way, to the U.S. zero option. The viewers often ask, why is the USSR coming out with this proposal now, and, metaphorically speaking, actually returning the ball to the U.S. court?

[Gerasimov] When the United States and NATO brought Pershings and cruise missiles to Europe, they allegedly did so to balance the situation because, supposedly, the USSR had new SS-20 missiles. We, however, have had missiles in Europe for a long time -- for many years. They were, however, replaced by new weapons. They were recently replaced by missiles the West calls SS-20's. Then they proposed to us the zero option. We did not accept it at the time, but we accept it now.

The question is, where does the difference lie? The difference lies in the fact that we now have a new leadership, and we are looking for ways to free the world of nuclear weapons.

A year ago, on 15 January, Mikhail Gorbachev put forward a program for eliminating nuclear weapons. In Reykjavik, President Reagan also said that he wished the world were free of nuclear weapons. It seems that our stances are in harmony. We are saying, correctly: When you introduced your medium-range missiles in response to ours, let us remove them together.

They say, however: But you also have operational and tactical missiles, and you have more of them. So, we say: Good, we will remove them, too. So, in effect, we rob them of their arguments.

Kohl and Thatcher say that the USSR agreed to talks on eliminating missiles because they were hard and decisive. If we did not deploy the missiles, then there would be no talks. But they have said nothing so far on operational and tactical missiles. They did not say that they want to further build up their stock of arms. And we say: Why do it? So what matters is not their display of decisiveness, but rather, it is our seeking ways to achieve a nonnuclear Europe and world. We seek these ways very actively, and perhaps we did not do this before. We call this active foreign policy, and it could also be called restructuring in the sphere of foreign policy.

[Editor, in Slovak] After Reykjavik the Soviet Union took out -- selected some questions -- from the so-called disarmament package. I am thinking of the Soviet approach to British and French missiles. What led the Soviet Union to change its stand on these?

[Gerasimov] Again it was looking for ways -- naturally we understand that this is a certain backing down on our party, but I think that if we do it, then the West should meet us halfway and look for a compromise. What is more, we now have such huge arsenals, that is the Soviet Union and the United States, that this certain imbalance, in certain systems, does not change the overall picture of nuclear parity.

[Editor] I would like to return to the question of the FRG, which you have already spoken about. We are witnesses to an evaluation full of contradictions of the Soviet proposals by official German representatives, representatives of the FRG, as far as the chancellor and the minister of foreign affairs are concerned. In the FRG weapons are even credited with being able to play some sort of constructive role in politics. One can speak about a certain cooling of relations between the Soviet Union and the FRG. How then, in this context, does the Soviet Union see the policy of the FRG?

[Gerasimov] As far as relations with the FRG on the liquidation of medium-range missiles in Europe are concerned, then naturally much depends on the FRG, because the Pershing-2s are sited on German territory. Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl said that by 7 May, when there was a debate on foreign policy in the Bundestag, he would outline his position; but he did not fulfill his promise. When he spoke there he said that he was giving only a temporary reply, and it certainly was a temporary reply. There was talk of operational and tactical missiles; there was a complaint there, which he have not yet spoken about, that, allegedly, we have more conventional weapons -- that is, the Warsaw Pact countries -- but an interesting situation arose recently, when, as I have already said, Helmut Kohl said: Let us destroy everything. My first reaction was, why not! We can agree, but when we start talks about everything then it will be a new package of proposals. Recently we extended our package of proposals, but the West continues to extend it. It is putting in not only missiles from zero to 1,000 km, but also conventional weapons -- that is, everything together. This again will mean killing the whole initiative. So I think it would be better to start on medium-range missiles. Here we are in agreement with the United States, and we need agreement from the allies, and then we can take operational and tactical missiles. We can have talks about this jointly or independently.

We are not against liquidating short-range missiles, tactical ones as mentioned by Kohl, and we are not against reducing the number of conventional weapons in Europe, as we proposed a year ago in Budapest at the session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee member states. We are proposing a reduction by a quarter. There are also chemical weapons. We are willing to liquidate them, and the talks on an agreement have already made considerable progress, so that we already have ready answers to all objections, and that is why the West now does not know what else to come up with. Many commentators are already writing that in 1981, when the West proposed the zero option, it proposed it for propaganda reasons and not seriously, because it was hoping that the Soviet Union's answer would be no. The Soviet Union really did say no, and now it has replied yes. It appears now that they were bluffing, and now they are quickly trying to think what to do.

The picture, however, is not clear. There are also signs that the Reagan administration still wants an agreement.

[Editor] You spoke, Comrade Gerasimov, about contradictions in the standpoints of Western Europe on Euromissiles and on nuclear disarmament as a whole. The same situation, as the U.S. press writes, exists in the United States. There, politicians are also divided into those in favor, or even against, Euromissiles. What is more, the Irangate affair comes into play, and this is being manipulated and some politicians have had their positions strengthened or weakened in this context. Do you think that this situation is manifesting itself in a more marked way during the Geneva talks, and is it at all possible to say which opinion, which approach, will carry more weight in the United States in the end?

[Gerasimov] It is difficult to forecast this at the moment. There are many factors here, but one internal political factor is that President Reagan's position has weakened. He was very popular for many reasons, in particular thanks to television. He knows how to speak on television very well. Many people say that this is in fact the main reason, and not his domestic or foreign policy. But now the Irangate scandal is very useful for his political opponents, the Democrats. They do not want to end it quickly but want to draw it out as long as possible, right up to the elections, to gain an advantage. They would not like the President to resign now. A strong person, the vice president, would then take office, and it would be more difficult to fight against him.

So now President Reagan's position has weakened and maybe, precisely because of this -- and many commentators say this -- he wants a foreign political success. What is the possible one? Precisely this agreement we are very close to now.

In principle we have agreed on liquidation -- the talks are about details. They are important, but still details, details of control. Many say that we will not agree with it, but we do agree, so there you are.

Some people try to convince us that control is not possible, Weinberger for example, the defense secretary. He appears to be against this because on his way to Norway, to Oslo, he spoke with journalists and said that the Russians cannot be trusted -- that is an old story -- that medium-range missiles are mobile, that they can hide them somewhere in taxis or anything that moves. I said at the meeting that Weinberger does not know us, he does not know our lives, that often it's hard to fit a passenger into a taxi, let alone a medium-range missile -- but such arguments do come up, and they show conflicts within the U.S. Administration itself. Those who formerly spoke in favor of detente, Nixon, Kissinger are now against, and the so-called black angel, for example [name indistinct] who was constantly for arming, is now in favor of this agreement, so many things have become mixed up there. It is difficult to forecast what will be next, but because the U.S. Administration nevertheless wants to achieve its end, and its period in office will be over soon, it wants to achieve success at the end of its period in office, I think that the U.S. Administration will proceed in the direction of agreement and so it will invite Mikhail Gorbachev to the United States, and enter into this agreement there, which we can now agree on.

Then there was a second question at the Geneva talks, as far as key standpoints are concerned, and this concerned strategic weapons and antimissile weapons. Our draft document -- the U.S. proposal for a 50 percent reduction in the number of these weapons.

[Presenter] I would like to return to the issue of medium-range missiles. This issue is of fundamental importance. Whether or not the draft of this agreement will be prepared -- or its administrative part -- is the decisive factor for the next meeting of Comrade Gorbachev and President Reagan [words indistinct].

[Gerasimov] It could be put this way. But, first, this treaty will be the first one concerning real reduction of armaments, as we put it -- the United States terms it the supervision [kontrola] of disarmament. I do not like this expression: What is necessary is to reduce the stockpile of weapons, and this will be the first agreement on reduction. Perhaps this is the reason so many are against this agreement. These are people who are, in principle, against any agreement with the USSR because they are afraid that it will be the first step, which will be followed by the second, and the third. It will be a pebble that will start an avalanche of nuclear disarmament. If such a treaty could be attained and could be concluded, then it will be a reason for which to go to the United States. Comrade Gorbachev said that he would like to go there, but he is a statesman, he has a lot to do, and he cannot go there as a tourist. He is already acquainted with Reagan, he met him twice -- why should he get acquainted with him for a third time? Therefore it is necessary to go only when a political result will be attained. We have made conditions: One is an agreement on medium-range missiles, and the second one is a certain mutual understanding in the key stances, on first strike missiles and on Star Wars.

[Editor] I would like to go back to what you said about the control of observance of the treaty on Euromissiles. Let us imagine that this treaty is already concluded, signed, ratified.

It is nice to imagine this. How would the concrete elimination of the missiles then continue? This is a question we often receive here from our viewers, and that often occurs in discussions. Is there any concrete plan regarding the elimination, the disassembling of Euromissiles?

[Gerasimov] It is a technical question we have been asked in the past -- what elimination means. It was never translated exactly, and they worried that the USSR would hide its missiles. But no, we speak about elimination. Perhaps we shall buy rusty equipment in Brno, automated rusty machinery that would grind it all. I do not know. (?But elimination is elimination.) There is, however, another question: 82 warheads in West Germany. It is also an interesting issue that could become an obstacle. We say: You must eliminate them, these are U.S. warheads. The answer is that they are on German missiles. Yes Germans bought them, but the FRG pledged in 1955 not to have nuclear weapons and therefore we have to take this into consideration, because France and Britain have their own nuclear weapons, and there are weapons in the FRG that belong to the United States. Now we hear that these warheads should remain, which is another obstacle.

[Editor] You have mentioned Caspar Weinberger, U.S. defense secretary, who is one of the most well-known opponents of this treaty on medium-range missiles. He is one of the great supporters of the so-called Star Wars plans. Recently the U.S. press published four Weinberger proposals that were sent to the government. Implementation of these proposals would mean that Star Wars would actually be realized in 1996 -- that is in a very short time. I would be interested, and our viewers too, what answer does the USSR want to give to these U.S. actions?

[Gerasimov] The Star War plans are rather problematic. No one is now sure -- including General Abrahamson, who is responsible for this program -- when they will be able to deploy something. So far research is continuing. Tests of individual components are starting. This is, however, rather an extensive program, which some people have compared to 10 Manhattan projects -- that is to the project to create the atom bomb. The technical problems in creating antimissile defenses are 10 times bigger than were the problems of creating the first nuclear weapons. So far, then, all this is still hanging in the air. Apart from this, the U.S. Congress has now cut the budget, compared to the sum requested by the administration. Congress itself doubts whether it is worthwhile making use of it.

We want to draw attention to the fact that we are not following this path. Some people accuse us of creating a similar type of defense, however we draw attention to the fact that we are not following this path. We would, however, have to carry out countermeasures, which would be much cheaper. Our scientists have come to the conclusion that it would cost only 5 percent of the expense the United States wants to spend to neutralize those space weapons.

However we are very actively against Star Wars, because they mean to take the arms race into space and then our world would be much more dangerous than now. All those systems would be flying over our heads, and they could be activated by a mere faulty computer. For example, before we started to record this program we had problems due to a mere change of wires -- although this studio is very well equipped. Systems are created by people, people are not perfect and consequently technology cannot be perfect either and might break down, and this could result in an enormous catastrophe.

In addition the question of who is to press the nuclear button is transferred from a leading political official to a computer: For if those systems were to be flying over our heads and assumed that a missile had been launched somewhere, then a decision would be made within several seconds. Thus a decision will not be made by a man but by a computer -- which naturally can make a mistake -- and therefore we point out that there is this danger in Star Wars. The system is very expensive, and in addition it will not save the United States. Our countermeasures will be much cheaper. There is still this danger of a technical accident.

[Editor] Could you nonetheless specify what the Soviet countermeasures will be?

[Gerasimov] Let me put it like this: If an antimissile defense is to be acceptable -- and they say they want to protect the whole territory of the country -- it must be 100 percent; it must be dense, because in contrast to air defense, one missile is enough to destroy the target, a whole city. A further missile will destroy a further target, and there are now very many missiles. In the last war, when air defense [3-second transmission break] when it was only 10 percent effective, that is to say that 10 percent of the aircraft were shot down. Then it was assumed that the target could not be bombarded, because the bombs were small, they had a small destructive force, and at the same time the aircraft crews were lost. So when the troops lost a bomber, they considered it ineffective.

Antimissile defense has to be very effective here. No one is saying that it will be 100 percent -- not even General Abrahamson says that [16-second transmission break] for example a further acceleration; for example there is talk of hitting a missile at the moment of launch. Now it takes, let's say 1 minute. I don't know for sure, but what if we speed up the launch with a stronger motor and then the launch will take, for example, 20 seconds? Those are technical measures that are much cheaper and completely possible. In addition, a considerable part of the antimissile defense will be in space. It is enough to put antisatellite weapons up there -- which we want to ban -- and blow them up, four antisatellite systems; and then an electromagnetic pulse will be produced which will disrupt the whole guidance system.

These are all variants of counteraction. There has always existed competition and rivalry between the sword and the shield, between the tank and the antitank weapon, just like the sword and the shield. Now, unfortunately, the shield will always have too many holes in it and the sword can always be sharpened.

[Editor] I have a question on a different subject: The West is very attentively analyzing and following what is happening today in the Soviet Union. When it understood that following the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum the situation was fundamentally changing and efforts were being made to attain rapid economic and social development in that country, all of a sudden there was a certain degree of concern and, it could be said, a fight against restructuring. Why is the West afraid of restructuring?

[Gerasimov] There are also many views here about their attitude to our restructuring. Now everything has indeed (?become clear). We have great differences of opinion with Margaret Thatcher on fundamental questions. She is in favor of nuclear weapons, she considers them a good thing, and we consider them an evil. Jacques Chirac is also in favor of nuclear deterrence. He thinks that people are crazy, that they will always fight. There is a French saying that fear of the gendarme is the basis of all wisdom, and therefore nuclear deterrence, in his view, will restrain us from attacking poor old France, even though we, of course, do not have any such aggressive plans.

As far as their attitude to restructuring is concerned, they are both political opponents of ours. But they support restructuring, they say that it is a good thing that the Soviet Union is moving in the kind of direction that will support our peace-loving nature. But there are opponents here, such as the unfortunate Weinberger who is of the opinion that the Soviet Union will increase its power and will strengthen itself. That means that its military power will also increase and it will be a more dangerous enemy, and therefore it is a bad thing and restructuring must be halted.

So, there are two different philosophies here, and we, of course, want the philosophy of coexistence to gain the upper hand, a philosophy according to which we have a joint interest in preserving peace. We are different, we can have our arguments, but we have a common philosophy about the preservation of peace. Others believe that confrontation will be unending, and therefore they think that the strengthening of the Soviet Union is a worse state of affairs for the West. In other words, the better it is for us, the worse it will be for you, and so on. But we think that the better it is for us, the better it will be for everyone, because we do not want a deep economic crisis in the West. We want countries to develop more or less in a normal way.

[Editor] Restructuring in Soviet society -- and our conversation today can be taken as proof of this -- naturally did not bypass the foreign policy of the Soviet Union itself. I could also say that the Soviet Union has changed a whole number of its representatives and diplomats abroad. It sends out delegations of diplomats who inform political representatives and the public about peace proposals, about what is happening in the Soviet Union. How does restructuring and also the principle of glasnost [preceding word in Russian] affect the foreign policy of the Soviet Union in other ways?

[Gerasimov] Commentators emphasize that our policy is much more active, much more dynamic. At the beginning of our conversation we gave a concrete example of the fact that various people, rather than we have changed people on various standpoints, not only ambassadors. In the final analysis, we have changed our standpoints. We use more public information.

As you know, at the moment in our country we have news conferences at which I continually appear. On 3 and 4 May at our ministry, an extended collegium took place where the annual results of the conference we had last year were evaluated. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke at this conference. He expressed his wishes about restructuring in the ministry and so we were making the first evaluation. We have done some things and much is yet to be done.

When you look in the newspapers, however, you will see that Comrade Shevardnadze, minister of foreign affairs, meets with someone everyday. We have visitors in Moscow constantly; someone is coming all the time. The foreign minister of Thailand was there. Jacques Chirac was there, and we have a whole list of other visitors. Everyone wishes to come to Moscow and it is already physically difficult for our leading officials to constantly have talks, but we must do this because there was a certain isolation, a certain stagnation in our foreign policy and now we must make up for it. Precisely those manifestations of stagnation that we criticize also appeared in foreign policy. We want to develop relations with all countries and we feel that some others are interested in us, for example Latin America.

The Brazilian ambassador invited Mikhail Gorbachev to visit Brazil. There are also invitations to other Latin American countries with which we have not had contacts at summit level up to now. Comrade Shevardnadze, on the other hand, visited countries of East Asia, and that is also a region we gave little attention. So, restructuring is taking place. The press and information departments were joined to make the Information Directorate. Then we began to appear more on television with our standpoints and views.

There was talk here also of our ambassadors who directly and personally deal with important missions and pass our views to the leading officials of other states. Our contacts with all countries have developed very widely.

[Editor] You mentioned your news conferences. You know that we follow them with great attention and I think that this also includes our viewers. For this reason, I would be interested to know how you prepare for each one. How do the fundamental standpoints on basic problems arise, how are they formulated, and in your view, what is the point of your news conferences?

[Gerasimov] The point of our conferences is to show that we are constantly present on the international information market, that we are there every day, that the international reader, the television viewer sees not only the Western standpoint but also our own. At present, in the Moscow Press Center we undertake more actions than there are working days. If you look at any 6 months let us say, there will be more press meetings and conferences there than there were working days. Today on Tuesday and Thursday we have a regular briefing. Foreign and our own correspondents are used to this.

I am not the only one who prepares myself. With helpers at our directorate we are in contact with all departments and sectors of the ministry. Once a week we discuss what is happening. We try to forecast something, to anticipate questions, and to decide what we have to say even if a question on it does not come up. Sometimes naturally we cannot foresee a question, it is quite unexpected and we must also reply.

[Editor] It was said that world interest in events in the Soviet Union is growing. Naturally, the interest of journalists to travel to the Soviet Union is also growing. Can it also be said that the objectivity of information in Western media about events in the Soviet Union is also growing?

[Gerasimov] Naturally we cannot even ask for complete objectivity from Western journalists because even if they say that they have freedom of the press in their countries and that they can write and say anything they like, in reality, naturally they work as their publisher, their editor-in-chief wishes. If they do not act that way then they will be recalled. They do not accept this but in any case we wish to give them our own version of a certain event and we must do this in a flexible and operative manner.

If we are late then the invented version will be put forward ahead of us. There are examples here: We were somewhat late for certain reasons, we did not wish to cause panic, and we ourselves did not know what had in fact happened, but this is the question of Chernobyl. We were a little late, I think about 3 days, and that was enough for terrible inventions to spread in the Western press in the course of 1 or 2 days. I was in Alaska at the time and the local newspapers there were being published with huge headlines that thousands of people died. Where did they get it from? We did not say it. No one said it. There was only a certain gap in our information that was immediately filled.

If we had said it a day earlier, they would not have been writing about the thousands. They could say, perhaps the Soviet Union is not telling everything but they could not invent such a terrible disaster. It was a catastrophe, but it was in completely different dimensions. We are trying to come to terms with this in some way, and when something like this takes place, naturally that's life, and we subsequently try to act operatively.

For example, there was regrettably another catastrophe: the ship "Admiral Nakhimov" sank. Immediately we called a news conference and the representative of the Ministry of Shipping appeared and said, such and such happened, and immediately we could remove some possible inventions about what had in fact happened.

This is already outside questions of foreign policy. These are domestic affairs, but we are trying to give as much information as possible, and as far as the objectiveness of Western journalists is concerned, when they get this information it is their professional duty to pass it on. They separate information from commentary. They have the professional duty to pass on information and when they sometimes deviate from this then they are immediately accused. Recently, for example, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT on 4 May published an article stating that socialist countries, including Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union, are trying to subvert the West by sending drugs there. This was called narcoterrorism, that is drug terrorism, that we are trying to defeat the West by flooding it with drugs. This is naturally a libelous article. We are against drugs. In fact we even stopped some being sent from Asia to Europe when they crossed our territory. We are fighting against this phenomenon and we do not wish the use of drugs on anyone.

At the next briefing, when this journalist put a question to me, I replied and then I said, I also have a question. Can you tell us in front of everyone why you published this? He stood up and said, perhaps this does not interest everyone, I will tell you that personally later. So, naturally there will be inventions and slanders.

[Editor] Did he tell you something later?

[Gerasimov] No, you know, he came to me and said, I will find out what it was that they wrote at home. So, regrettably we have to be ready for even such very ordinary slanders.

[Editor] As we know, there is a lot of talk and writing today in the Soviet Union about the new stage in the development of relations between the socialist states, that in essence it is a matter of the restructuring of these relations. Can you be more specific about this fundamental issue?

[Gerasimov] We believe that as socialist countries on the international scene we must act together, but at the same time we must respect one another, and we say that everyone should present his own initiatives, that we must think about them together. Such initiatives do exist, for example last year at the session of the General Assembly a joint initiative was implemented on the conception of comprehensive security, and just recently Poland presented an enterprising plan, the Jaruzelski plan. Czechoslovakia, the GDR, and the German Social Democratic Party had a very good idea about a nuclear-free corridor in central Europe. We also supported that. In other words, we want to say that our countries, the Warsaw Pact countries, must think together about how to ensure peace in our region of Europe.

As for our general relations, they must be completely even, without any exceptions, and this is a matter for journalists. There is talk of how we report about our country. Somehow we have become accustomed to always writing in the same tone, in favorable tones, I would say, but at the same time we do have problems. So it is not a matter of these problems being untouchable -- on the contrary, they must be spoken about, in a tactful way, but spoken about so that they are dealt with to the benefit of all the participating countries and parties.

We also have problems in CEMA, and these must be positively criticized and solutions must be sought. For example, recently the Soviet newspaper TRUD published an article about the export of Czechoslovak footwear to the Soviet Union. Czechoslovak shoes had, at one time, great prestige in the Soviet Union. I remember that I used to buy such shoes myself as a student, and I was unable to wear them out. Now there is a different attitude toward Czechoslovak shoes -- this must be spoken about. Perhaps it is the Soviet side that is to blame because of its specifications or its orders, or perhaps it is the Czechoslovak side. We do not want to insult anyone. We have to think about ensuring that your shoes retain their reputation and that we are supplied with good shoes, but we find that this is not the case. I think that articles like this when, for example, two Soviet journalists and their Czechoslovak colleague are involved, such articles help us a great deal. This genre did not exist in the past or hardly used to exist and I think that it is a further feature of restructuring.

[Editor] Comrade Gerasimov, time is unfortunately running out although there are still a whole number of questions on the table, particularly in the area of regional problems; viewers often ask us about developments in Afghanistan, the state of Soviet-Chinese relations, the latest developments in the Persian Gulf -- but of course as I have said, time is running out, so I would like to conclude by putting a kind of personal question to you: What event in the past year have you been glad to report to journalists at news conferences in Moscow, and what event would you like to be able to report to them in the coming period?

[Gerasimov] Both the past and the future, you mean? I haven't been working at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for a very long time, not even a year yet, but in that time, I would say that the event in the past that has given me particular pleasure was when I was in New York with the minister at the General Assembly; after that we went to Washington to meet leading U.S. officials. They were difficult talks; there were a number of secondary issues -- the issues of those spies, and so forth, and then all of a sudden the U.S. Administration replied positively to our proposal for a summit. That was really a very nice moment when we all felt pleased that a meeting was going to take place in Reykjavik; we said that it was not a summit as such, but instead a preparatory meeting.

That meeting took place, and it produced definite results. On the one hand it did not produce what we had been hoping for on the matter of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative and the fixed idea or attempt by the President to achieve that antimissile shield. But on the other hand, definite accords were reached, and they are now talking on the basis of those accords in Geneva. For example, now we are discussing the matter of medium-range missiles, that is, something that originated at Reykjavik. That, then, produced positive emotions for me.

As regards the future, I would hope very much that Reykjavik continues, that we reach an agreement on eradicating medium-range missiles, that we agree on a nuclear-free Europe, and finally that we agree too on operational strategic weapons [operativni strategicke zbrane] and leave aside any plans for Star Wars.

III. 22 May 87

AA 11

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

That is the program, and I don't think it is only a fantasy, because world public opinion generally speaking does not believe in the Soviet threat; it believes that the threat comes from nuclear weapons, and therefore I think we can look to the future with optimism.

[Presenter] Comrade Gerasimov, allow me, on behalf of the journalists here in the studio and on behalf of the television viewers, to thank you for your open and sincere replies. I hope we will have the opportunity to meet once again in the studio of Czechoslovak television in Prague for another roundtable. For now, it is good-bye till the next roundtable.

VORONTSOV INTERVIEWED ON ARMS TALKS, ABM

AU211307 Sofia ZEMEDEL'SKO ZNAME in Bulgarian 19 May 87 pp 1, 4

["Conversation with Yuliy Vorontsov, leader of the Soviet delegation at the negotiations in Geneva," conducted by Spartak Beglov, NOVOSTI political observer: "Nonmilitarization of Space and Nuclear Disarmament -- Inseparably Linked Problems"]

[Text] Geneva, 18 May (correspondent's report for ZEMEDEL'SKO ZNAME) -- The nonmilitarization of space and the reduction of strategic offensive weapons are two problems that cannot be separated from one another, stressed Yuliy Vorontsov, leader of the Soviet delegation at the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva, in our conversation.

On 5 May the Soviet delegation put forward a proposal at the negotiations that "key positions for agreements" on this issue should be agreed. The Soviet draft document envisages that the two sides should reduce their strategic offensive weapons by 50 percent over a 5-year period, so that at the end of this period each of them would possess no more than 1,600 strategic weapons of the "triad" (land-, sea-, and air-based nuclear weapon carriers) carrying a maximum of 6,000 nuclear warheads. This decision must be adopted together with an agreement in principle to strengthen the regime of the ABM Treaty, which envisages mutually binding the two sides not to renounce the treaty for a period of 10 years and to strictly observe the treaty.

Bearing in mind the crucial importance of the problems of nondeployment of weapons in outer space and of observing the ABM Treaty, the Soviet Union considers that it is also necessary to make the provision that, if under the terms of the agreement for reduction of strategic offensive weapons either of the sides should decide to begin the practical creation [suzdavane] of a space ABM system, then the other side will have the right to consider itself released from observing the obligation to reduce its strategic offensive weapons.

On 8 May the U.S. delegation submitted in Geneva its own draft agreement on strategic offensive weapons. President Reagan's declaration in this connection points out that the 50-percent reduction of these weapons the United States proposed as before contains the proposal concerning "sublimits." At the same time the President stated that the United States will not find acceptable any kind of measures that restrict Washington's efforts connected with the implementation of the SDI program.

It follows from this that the two fundamental obstacles to reaching an agreement on strategic offensive weapons have still not been eliminated.

Let us start with the first of these obstacles, which is the issue of "sublimits." The U.S. representatives connected with the Geneva negotiations have more than once let it be understood that in this manner they would like to radically alter the essence of the Soviet "triad." For example, it is well known that the Soviet defensive potential is based on intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM), whereas the United States is relying on developing missiles with multiple warheads launched from submarines, as well as variously based cruise missiles, including cruise missiles mounted on heavy bombers (the USSR has only 160 bombers, whereas the United States has 518). The "sublimit" the United States proposes for the Soviet ICBM's, namely, 1,650 warheads, would in fact make it impossible for the USSR to deploy the mobile missiles of this class that are designed to replace the previous generation of heavy missiles. The U.S. reference to their readiness to "make compensation to the USSR for the higher sublimit of their own heavy bombers" is a primitive trick. In actual fact this is nothing other than a gross encroachment on the historically created structure of the Soviet defensive potential with the aim of making it necessary to reform this structure, with all the additional efforts and vast expenditure that inevitably arise from this.

"Their chief aim," Yu. Vorontsov informed me, "is to attempt to impose such changes in the structure of the Soviet potential as to correspond to the future SDI program." With the present numbers of warheads possessed by the two sides, no form of SDI will have any effect. However, the United States seems to think that they will be able to create an SDI for 6,000 warheads, that is, to acquire a "space shield" for making a first strike with impunity. We will not assist them in this work.

The Soviet proposals concerning preserving the regime of the ABM Treaty provide for agreement to be reached on a list of installations that will be permitted or forbidden to be deployed in outer space in the course of scientific research activities in the field of the space ABM system. What does one have in mind here? Systems exist that are already in operation in near-earth orbit: observation and warning satellites, that is, so-called warning sensor systems. But any system that might be capable of attacking, shooting down, or destroying must not be permitted under any circumstances, the leader of the Soviet delegation emphasized.

Can it be expected that the agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe, if it becomes a reality, will exert a favorable effect on the other great problems of nuclear disarmament? Yes, the elimination of medium-range missiles is a good incentive for reducing strategic weapons. It is an important component of the entire Soviet program for eliminating nuclear weapons in stages up to the year 2000. Yu. Vorontsov pointed out. "The process of dismantling and eliminating the medium-range missiles would provide good practical experience. Let us take, for example, working out measures for verifying the fulfillment of the agreement. In our proposals on this issue we are going even further than the United States," stressed the leader of the Soviet delegation, "more specifically, in the field of verification of the enterprises in which medium-range missiles are produced. According to the U.S. proposal the inspectors will be sent only to the gates of the enterprises. We propose that they should also be granted access inside the enterprises."

"Physical elimination, physical destruction of the missiles -- this is what we are calling for so firmly and decisively at the negotiations with the United States underlined Yu. Vorontsov. "We would like to see the missiles being eliminated, and the other side too would like to see that the missiles are eliminated, dismantled, and destroyed before the eyes of everyone. This will be a good start toward the total elimination of nuclear weapons on earth."

U.S. CONDUCTS SDI TEST, 'DESTROYING' ABM TREATY

LD220805 Moscow TASS in English 0617 GMT 22 May 87

[Text] Washington May 22 TASS -- Another test has been conducted in the U.S. within the framework of the "Star Wars" program. A spokesman of the Pentagon reported Thursday night that it had been carried out at the White Sands military test site, New Mexico. During the test a superfast rocket hit in the flight a Lance Tactical missile.

It is the second such test conducted in the U.S.

It is noteworthy that along with active tests within the framework of the "Star Wars" program the Reagan Administration is in a hurry to prepare a legal basis for its full-scale implementation. Thus, U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger sent a letter to the Senate of U.S. Congress in which he again urged to accept a so-called "broad interpretation" of the Soviet-American ABM Treaty, whose traditional interpretation bans the testing and deployment of ABM systems in outer space. Washington intends to use the "broad interpretation" for destroying the main content of the treaty and paving the way for the militarization of space.

PAVE PAWS RADAR STATION VIOLATES ABM TREATY

PM191505 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 May 87 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Contrary to ABM Treaty"]

[Text] Washington, 12 May -- The United States has completed the creation of the network of Pave Paws large phased-array radar stations, which can be employed for purposes of the antimissile defense of U.S. territory. According to a report in DEFENSE NEWS, a newspaper close to military-industrial circles, the fourth Pave Paws-type radar station became operational "ahead of schedule" at the El Dorado airbase (Texas). Pave Paws systems have also been deployed at Beale (California), Robins (Georgia) and Cape Cod (Massachusetts) AFB's. As DEFENSE NEWS points out, this radar system "tracks intercontinental ballistic missiles, and also accumulates information about more than 6,000 satellites."

In flagrant contravention of the ABM Treaty, which forbids the construction of large phased-array radar stations outside the boundaries of national territory, the United States is constructing a powerful new radar station at the air base near Thule in Greenland. The creation of this radar station is being carried out under the guise of "modernizing" old stations. The construction of a second such station is planned for the Fylingdales Moor area of Britain.

WHITE HOUSE 'SECRET' ABM REPORT ISSUED

LD211002 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0300 GMT 21 May 87

[By TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev]

[Text] Washington, 21 May (TASS) -- The White House has sent its latest report to Capitol Hill aimed at torpedoing the Soviet-U.S. treaty limiting antimissile defense systems, which remains the cornerstone of the strategic arms limitation process.

In a secret report officially handed to Congress on Wednesday, the Pentagon gives a detailed description of the work and trials in the "Star Wars" program that the United States will be able to carry out, applying a so-called "broad" interpretation to the treaty, which was signed in 1972. As is clear from U.S. press reports, the main task of the recommendations it contains is to speed up implementation of the program of space militarization. According to information obtained by THE NEW YORK TIMES, the Pentagon is, for example, proposing to stage four trials of space-based systems in violation of the ABM Treaty. The United States, the report says, must either go over immediately to a new interpretation of the agreement or renounce it altogether at some stage.

A special statement made by the White House in connection with the handing of the Pentagon report to Congress says that, alongside other "research" for the Administration, it is supposed to "secure the basis for making a decision" on changing the structure and direction of work in the "Star Wars" program, in accordance with a "broad" interpretation of the ABM Treaty. Asserting that SDI is allegedly "important for the future of the security of the United States and its allies", the White House called upon Congress "to avoid steps that could undermine" this program.

The administration has made this call in a situation where, as the weekly CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY puts it, the most important debates of the 1980's on military issues are getting under way on Capitol Hill. On the very same day Congress was presented with the Pentagon report, the supporters of the "Star Wars" program prevented the start of discussion in the Senate of the bill on the U.S. military budget for fiscal 1988 for the third successive time. The aim of the parliamentary obstruction tactics employed by the Republican senators is to get the amendments requiring that the administration strictly observe the ABM Treaty excluded from the bill. As Sam Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Forces Committee, on whose initiative this amendment was brought, said the U.S. Congress will not allow President Reagan to use SDI funds for a unilateral renunciation of the traditional interpretation of the treaty.

On Wednesday the Democrats, who introduced this amendment to the bill, were just one vote short of stopping the obstruction set up by the Republicans. R. Byrd, the leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, said that in the next few days another vote will be held in order to proceed to discussion of the military budget. But R. Dole, the leader of the Republican minority, warned that President Reagan will nonetheless veto the bill unless the amendment requiring that the ABM Treaty be observed is removed from it.

CHERNYSHEV VIEWS U.S. OPPOSITION TO ABM TREATY

LD220440 Moscow TASS in English 0016 GMT 22 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 21 TASS -- Follows commentary by Vladimir Chernyshev, TASS military news analyst:

The White House has made another step towards torpedoing the Soviet-American ABM Treaty, which is without time-limit, by sending to Congress the Pentagon's report containing recommendations to speed up sharply the implementation of the SDI programme and to this end either go over to a "broad interpretation" of the said treaty, or give it up altogether some time later.

What does that move imply? In the first place that the U.S. Administration is determined to carry on the policy of impairing the international-legal regime, of knocking key links out of it. Washington, which earlier renounced the interim agreement SALT-I and the SALT-II treaty, is now trying to destroy the ABM Treaty, which is one of the fundamentals on which Soviet-American relations are built.

Second, the current American leadership is out to renounce the signature put by the United States under the ABM Treaty fifteen years ago, and go back on its own commitment to prevent arms race in outer space which is placed on record in the Geneva statement on the Soviet-American summit meeting in November 1985.

Third, the White House is clearly set not only to revive soon, but also to raise to an even higher level the perennial competition between the "shield" and "sword", which is particularly dangerous in this nuclear space age. Since the signing of the ABM Treaty in 1972 was an expression of great political wisdom of both the USSR and the USA, recognition by them of the objective fact that the renunciation of national anti-ballistic missile systems is the most reasonable and effective method of defence from a nuclear-missile attack.

Fourth, the U.S. leadership is out to break the most important barrier in the way of the weapons race, to destroy the hopes of the peoples for the possible deep cuts in the strategic offensive weapons with the aim of their total destruction in the future. They in Washington should realise that without the ABM Treaty there will be no treaties on strategic offensive forces and that after the destruction of the treaty the nuclear missile race will assume a new dimension -- an arms race in outer space will be added to it.

As far as the essence of the so-called "broad interpretation" of the ABM Treaty is concerned, the total irrelevance of the revision of interpretation of the treaty has been convincingly proved not only by the Soviet Union, but also by American experts who took part in hammering out the treaty, as well as the prominent disarmament experts in U.S. Congress. It is apt to recall at least one fact which is evidence of the total unfoundedness of the U.S. Administration's attempts at "linking" SDI with the ABM Treaty. Since first spokesmen for the U.S. leadership wished to "prove" that the treaty had allegedly become "outdated". [sentence as received] When it became clear that this gimmick won't work, since the laws of logic underlying the treaty are without any term of limitation and the progress of science and technology is graphic proof of the need for strengthening its regime, they undertook to misconstrue the basic provisions of that important document.

All this is evidence that the current U.S. Administration, eager to meet every wish of the military-industrial complex is capable of abandoning any treaties and agreements, renouncing its own international commitments and disregarding the opinion of U.S. Congress.

It is high time for some people in Washington to realise that without a strict observance of the treaties, the more so such an important treaty as that on ABM there is no way to ensure international order and basic stability.

NEW TIMES Commentary

LD211724 Moscow TASS in English 1603 GMT 21 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 21 TASS -- "In 1972 the Soviet Union and the United States agreed to set certain limits to the build-up of their strategic nuclear-missile offensive arms and to reduce to the minimum their strategic defense systems", Georgiy Korniyenko writes in the latest issue of the Soviet weekly NEW TIMES.

"It was particularly difficult 'to overcome the psychological barrier, namely, as regards the elaboration of the ABM Treaty'".

"However, common awareness prevailed: In the nuclear missile age the indisputable right of every country to defence can be realised in the best way through mutual renunciation of the ABM defence systems of their territories".

"The ABM Treaty was concluded", Georgiy Korniyenko goes on, "and there are no ambiguities in it. This undoubtedly became possible due to the fact that the then U.S. leadership headed by President Richard Nixon, upon realistically evaluating the correlation of forces in the world and the tendency towards its further development, reasonably arrived together with the Soviet leadership to the following conclusion: In the nuclear age, there is no other basis for the maintainance of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union except peaceful coexistence".

"When the Reagan administration took office", the analyst points out, "a foreign policy course from the position of strength was publically proclaimed, and the principle of equality and equal security with regard to the USSR was anathematized".

"The Reagan administration, counting on force and on achieving military superiority, and relying on U.S. technological advantages, chose an attempt at bringing weapons to outer space", the news analyst goes on.

"But there is the ABM Treaty in the path of its designs. So, the authors of the SDI invented a 'broad interpretation' of the ABM Treaty and began to assert that the ABM systems and components being developed under the SDI programme and based on different physical principles may be developed and tested without any restrictions, and in outer space as well".

Georgiy Korniyenko describes such a stand as untenable legally and nonsensical logically.

"The opinion of the Soviet side is that at present the need to keep, and the more so, to consolidate the ABM Treaty does not diminish but increases by virtue of the same laws of logic which brought the treaty into being", the news analyst writes in conclusion.

SOLTON ON APPLYING DISARMAMENT PLAN TO ASIA

LD211459 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 21 May 87

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] Work is underway in Geneva to coordinate agreement on the total removal of Soviet and American medium-range missiles from Europe. At the same time a draft treaty provides for the Soviet Union to retain 100 warheads on such missiles in its eastern part and for the same number to be retained by the United States on its territory. Listeners have been wondering why the so-called zero-option on medium-range missiles is applicable in Europe but not applicable in Asia. Radio Moscow's Yuriy Solton writes the following:

Such an option can well be applied to Asia and moreover that is what the Soviet Union has been working for. In his speech of 19 May Mikhail Gorbachev reaffirmed the Soviet Union's readiness to resolve the problem of medium-range missiles on a global basis. But this would require reciprocity from the United States. The Americans have accumulated a powerful nuclear force in the Asia-Pacific region. This first of all includes the U.S. Air Force units based on the Philippines and in Japan. Secondly, it is the complex military infrastructure in South Korea, which makes it possible to deploy there not only Lance short-range missiles but also nuclear means of a longer range that are capable reaching targets in the Soviet Union, China and other countries. These are the circumstances that have compelled the Soviet Union to counter the American measures by deploying nuclear weapons in the Soviet east, for purely defensive purposes.

There would be no obstacles in applying the zero-option to Asia if the United States scrapped its nuclear weapons in Japan, South Korea and the Philippines and if it withdrew its marine-borne aviation beyond the coordinated lines. Besides, the United States should have no medium-range missiles on its own territory. But fresh reports from Washington have been proving that the American Administration is so far not ready for such a decision. So, the Soviet consent to retaining 100 warheads both on Soviet and American medium-range missiles would be regarded as a compromise. Mikhail Gorbachev has said that our vigorous efforts to rid Europe of nuclear weapons are by no means aimed at having the nuclear threat moved to any part of the world. Europe, with its largest nuclear stockpiles, marks only the starting point of our course toward the scrapping of all nuclear weapons on all continents by the year 2000, in line with the program announced by the Soviet Union on 15 January 1986. This program is to lay the foundations for a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

GREMITSKIKH 21 MAY FOREIGN MINISTRY NEWS CONFERENCE

Shultz' Asia-Pacific Remarks

LD211546 Moscow TASS in English 1530 GMT 21 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 21 TASS -- "In his recent speech at Stanford University U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz made remarks containing inventions concerning the Soviet Union and its policy in the Pacific Ocean region", Yuriy Gremitskikh, a spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said at a briefing for journalists here today.

"Mr. Shultz took liberties with obvious facts, and interpreted them arbitrarily. He perceives a threat to stability in the Asian-Pacific region in the development of all-round Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation and regards it as a factor in the aggravation of the situation in that part of the world".

"At a time when all sober-minded political figures approvingly regard the Soviet Union's steps to normalise relations between the countries of the region, Mr. Shultz asserts that the USSR ostensibly makes use of regional tension in its own interests".

"While accusing the Soviet Union of a massive build up of nuclear and conventional arms in Asia, the U.S. secretary of state, apparently, deliberately forgets about the large-scale initiatives which the Soviet Union proposed in the field of disarmament most recently."

"It is well-known to Mr. Shultz that it is precisely the U.S. Administration that seeks to leave in Asia the nuclear systems deployed against the Soviet Union. This makes us look for an answer and maintain the balance of forces there".

"At the same time we have repeatedly stated our readiness to tackle the problems of medium-range missiles on a global basis. Already now we suggest starting headway in directions leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons in Asia. This was stated in utter clarity by Mikhail Gorbachev in his May 19 speech at the dinner given in honor of Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee".

"The meaning of pronouncements by Mr. Shultz is that the United States and some of its allies lately take steps aimed at undermining the progressive development of positive processes in the Asian-Pacific region, the processes in which the USSR, Vietnam and other socialist countries took the lead".

"Through his speech at Stanford University Mr. Shultz countered the policy of goodwill and confidence-building measures in the region by a course towards maintaining a 'reliable deterrence capability', i.e. towards militarising the region, towards stirring up conflicts, and towards replacing relations of good-neighbourliness and cooperation between the countries of the region by a policy of confrontation and animosity and the establishment of closed military-political groupings", pointed out the spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

"Soviet political analysts are surprised", the spokesman said, "that the United States has so hastily reacted and, besides, at the level of a State Department press spokesman to the far-reaching constructive proposals put forward on May 19 by Mikhail Gorbachev about a solution to the problem of medium-range missiles on a global basis if the United States agrees to eliminate its nuclear systems in Japan, South Korea, and in the Philippines, and to withdraw its aircraft-carrier flotilla to beyond agreed-upon boundaries".

"Such an approach to the Soviet proposals does not correspond to the importance and the level of the well-reasoned Soviet proposals which deserve the most serious attention and study", emphasized the spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Anti-Soviet Campaign in Japan

LD211513 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 21 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 21 TASS -- A new anti-Soviet campaign has been started in Japan sustained by a spy craze and involving slanderous insinuations about some staff members of Soviet institutions, a briefing for journalists was told today by Yuriy Gremitskikh, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman.

Japanese police detained a staff member of the Soviet Trade Mission in Tokyo but had to release him due to an absence of any evidence whatsoever of any unlawful actions by him. The Soviet Embassy in Tokyo has strongly protested to the Japanese Foreign Ministry the unlawful detention of the Soviet citizen.

Publications in the Japanese mass media show that this anti-Soviet campaign was planned in advance and is of an obvious provocative nature. It is noteworthy that its organizers have resorted to well-known standard methods of directness. Groundless insinuations about Soviet citizens appeared in Japan as well whenever a certain improvement in Soviet-Japanese relations began to take shape and were designed to foil or at least to retard this process. There is no doubt, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said, that this time the provocative outcry was instigated by those forces that want to sow mistrust in the Soviet Union and its peace-loving foreign policy, to complicate relations between the USSR and Japan, which are far from simple as it is, and to prevent their development.

By way of this unseemly trick, these forces also intend to divert the Japanese public's attention from the really urgent problems that Japan encounters in reality in its relations with some other countries.

It is evident, Yuriy Gremitskikh stressed, that the hostile campaign unfolded in Japan runs counter to the positive moments that have appeared lately in Soviet-Japanese relations, and does nothing to help them gain momentum.

Remarks on CSCE

LD211636 Moscow TASS in English 1435 GMT 21 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 21 TASS -- "Attention has been paid in Moscow to a meeting of representatives of the neutral and nonaligned countries, which had participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), in Cyprus on May 16-17 at foreign ministers' level", Yuriy Gremitskykh, a spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists here today.

"We welcome the determination expressed by the ministers to make efforts to ensure the adoption of a substantive and balanced final document in Vienna," he said.

"The Soviet Union, for its part, intends energetically to act in the same direction. An opinion, which was expressed by the ministers to the effect that security issues are of vital importance of all CSCE participating states and that disarmament is an integral component of security, is shared in the USSR".

"We also paid attention to an opinion expressed by them that a final document in Vienna should include provisions concerning a continuation of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, including the question of supplementing the conference's mandate with a view to reaching further agreements".

"The ministers' statement about the need to find within the CSCE context of a structure which would enable all the participating states to ensure their national security interests is appreciated in the USSR", Yuriy Gremitskikh emphasized.

"As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, our stand is clear: We are in favour of ensuring the legitimate right of neutral and non-aligned countries to an active participation in the discussion of disarmament issues in Europe".

Denies Effort To Reunify Germany

LD211646 Moscow TASS in English 1526 GMT 21 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 21 TASS -- Today Yuriy Gremitskikh, a USSR Foreign Ministry representative, said at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists that the West German DPA agency had circulated a report on May 14 about a reply by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, to a question by a correspondent of the second programme of West German television: Is it possible that the Soviet side will put forth a "proposal on reunification of Germany?"

He said that the DPA's report started with an allegation that the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman "neither refuted nor confirmed that the Soviet Union may propose reunification of the FRG and the GDR".

All those present at the briefing of May 14 heard, Yu. Gremitskikh went on to say, that the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman clearly said that the FRG and the GDR had emerged after the war and they had been developing along different ways. These are objective facts which cannot be disregarded.

In the light of this pronouncement, the allegation of the DPA correspondent that the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman neither refuted nor confirmed concoctions of some West German press organs is improper at the least, Yu. Gremitskikh pointed out.

U.S. Warship Border Violation

LD211236 Moscow TASS in English 1222 GMT 21 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 21 TASS -- The U.S. Navy's nuclear-powered cruiser Arkansas violated the state border of the Soviet Union in the area of the Avacha Bay on May 17 and 21 1987, a spokesman for the foreign ministry of the USSR said here today.

Yuriy Gremetskikh added at a briefing for newsmen here: "There is no doubt that the actions by the U.S. warships were premeditated and provocative and that they were taken in clear violation of the laws and rules of the USSR regarding the regime of Soviet territorial waters."

The Soviet spokesman said a strong protest had been declared to the U.S. Government over the border violations.

"The American side was told that such violations could have most serious consequences all responsibility for which would be squarely on the United States," he continued.

"It was also demanded that the American side take every essential measure to rule out such incidents in the future," Gremetskikh said.

CORRECTION TO PYADYSHEV'S REMARKS ON ABM TREATY

The following correction pertains to the item subheaded "U.S. ABM Treaty Interpretation," published in the 21 May Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page CC 2, paragraph one, line three:

All the records of the U.S. delegation now being published refer to discussions by the sides at the talks only of those possible future ABM systems or components, based on different physical principles, which are capable of replacing components of the system permitted under the treaty -- a stationary land-based system in a defined region -- and by no means of those which are banned under the treaty -- that is, sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based. [rewording for clarity]

LD220352 Moscow TASS in English 0247 GMT 22 May 87

Is a person entitled to nominating his own self to run for parliament, are election publicity shows necessary, is a deputy responsible to his electorate, what is the gist of the new Soviet election law? All these and many other questions touched off a lively discussion, taking part in which from the Soviet side were in particular deputies Vadim Zagladin, Georgiy Arbatov, Irina Blokhina and Kiril Lavrov, from the American side -- Senator Alan Cranston, Congressmen George Brown, Claudine Schneider, Tom Downey and others.

Winding up the discussions, Claudine Schneider, Republican representative from Rhode Island, said that the potential of TV hook-ups between law-makers is vast. She expected an even broader exchange of information. She expressed optimism that this process would very soon bear its good fruit.

The success of the first television hook-up predetermined the possibility of continuing the dialogue of MPs across the ocean. As newsmen were told, three television discussions were scheduled for September, October and November. They are devoted to burning problems -- arms control, human rights and regional conflicts.

NAVAL PRESENCE IN GULF TO BE PRESERVED

LD211048 Moscow TASS in English 0925 GMT 21 May 87

[Text] Washington May 21 TASS -- The United States does not intend to scale down its military presence in the Persian Gulf despite the incident involving the American missile frigate Stark.

This was confirmed by the U.S. secretary of defense Caspar Weinberger. Addressing Wednesday representatives of the military-industrial complex he said that the death of 37 sailors should not weaken America's resolve to keep up the level of its naval presence in the Persian Gulf. The head of the Pentagon said the United States should not shirk its global responsibility even in face of death.

Weinberger contended that free access to sea lanes in this oil-rich region was of exceptional strategic importance for the United States, which he described as the "leader of the free world", and for its allies.

REAGAN, PAKISTAN'S YAQUB KHAN DISCUSS MILITARY AID

LD211132 Moscow TASS in English 0950 GMT 21 May 87

[Text] Washington May 21 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports:

President Ronald Reagan held at the White House on Wednesday negotiations with Pakistan's foreign minister S. Yaqub Khan who is completing his official visit to the United States.

The details of the meeting are not disclosed but local political news analysts note that the main aim of the Washington visit of the high-placed emissary of the Islamabad regime is to have broader American military aid to Pakistan. The question of supplies of AWACS planes to Pakistan is specifically being discussed at negotiations with officials of the U.S. Administration. In exchange, Islamabad is ready to help sharply step up operations of Afghan dushmans from the bases of Pakistan's territory.

Judging by the pronouncements by other American officials, the U.S. Administration already gave consent in principle to supply Islamabad with AWACS planes. Technical details of the deal are now being thrashed out.

MUDSLIDE THREATENS SUPPLY LINK TO AFGHANISTAN

LD202033 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 20 May 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Strong floods and mudslides have come this spring to the northern foothill regions of Afghanistan. [passage omitted]

[M. Leshchinskiy, identified by screen caption] This is how the km 332 of the road from Kabul to the border of the Soviet Union looks now. It is called the road of life in Afghanistan. A powerful mudslide there washed away farms and bridges. Traffic was interrupted. There was a danger to supplies of essential goods to the central regions of Afghanistan. Immediately units and detachments of the Soviet Army came to the help of the Afghans. [video shows bridge destroyed, armed troops moving stones, armored vehicle, column of trucks]

With soldierly action, precisely and efficiently, the soldiers, together with Soviet and Afghan specialists, were able to restore traffic in a matter of hours. A total of 8,000 trucks and buses were sent through in the (?week of the emergency). [passage omitted]

DRA RECONCILIATION PROCESS VARIES WITHIN PROVINCES

LD181200 Moscow TASS in English 1100 GMT 18 May 87

[Text] Kabul May 18 TASS -- Another 180 Afghan citizens returned home from Pakistan, responding to the call for national reconciliation. Local authorities rendered them material and financial assistance and provided with jobs. By now over 1,600 Afghans returned home in the Konarha Province alone. More than 200 people returned to native places in the Vardak Province.

Understanding senselessness of further bloodshedding, many leaders of armed anti-government units start ceasefire negotiations. Such negotiations are under way with 24 groups in the Konarha Province. Agreements on non-resumption of combat operations were signed with 13 leaders of opposition groups.

At the same time there are facts showing that the process of reconciliation takes different turns in various provinces. Chieftains of some gangs do not enter negotiations with people's power, believing that the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and the government encroach on their legitimate rights and traditions which have been shaping up for centuries. In the Vardak Province, for instance, only 20 people have laid down arms since the proclamation of the policy of reconciliation.

THAI FOREIGN MINISTER SPEAKS AT 11 MAY LUNCHEON

BK211436 Bangkok Voice of Free Asia in English 1500 GMT 12 May 87

[Report on "Reply" Speech by Thai Foreign minister Sitthi Sawetsila at 11 May Moscow luncheon for him hosted by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze]

[Text] When addressing the question of peace and security in Southeast Asia, one cannot disregard the central issue of the Kampuchean conflict. In fact, it is this very issue that has been the focus of our discussion so far. We are convinced that the Soviet Union is capable of playing a principal role in the resolution of this problem, which has threatened the security of all the countries concerned, and has held back the prospect of peace and friendly relations, particularly between countries of the region. As a great power seeking a greater role in the Asia and Pacific region, the Soviet Union is being constantly watched to see whether she will use her immense influence and prestige to advance the cause of peace. In the eyes of all ASEAN countries, Kampuchea is the test case in which earnest cooperation by the Soviet Union to realize its durable settlement is expected in this regard. We are encouraged by Your Excellency's remarks to the effect that the Soviet Union favors a quick settlement of Kampuchea by political means, which entails an early withdrawal of foreign troops from Kampuchea, the exercise of the fundamental right of the Kampuchean people to self-determination, and the emergence of an independent and neutral Kampuchea which poses no threat to her neighbors.

Admittedly, there remains considerable apprehension and lack of understanding about the Soviet attitude and role towards Southeast Asia. ASEAN earnestly supports the efforts to lessen such an outlook which is possible is central and substantive issues giving rise to mistrust and apprehension are squarely addressed. This process would surely pave the way toward genuine cooperation between the Soviet Union and the regional states of ASEAN to enhance the prospect of a peaceful international environment and mutually beneficial ties between us.

I believe that Your Excellency shares with me this vision of peace and prosperity for Asia and the Pacific region. Furthermore, I am certain that such Soviet effort would instill confidence in developing sound and trustworthy relations between the Soviet Union and the regional states. I have spoken out with candor about the task we share in realizing the common goals set by us -- the promotion of a peaceful international environment through mutually beneficial relations among the regional states. The world has heard and welcomed the positive message of Vladivostok and anxiously awaits its implementation. We in ASEAN are confident that the Soviet Union will not fail in this endeavor, which has our unqualified endorsement and support.

CAMBODIAN LEADERS CITED ON RECONCILIATION HOPES

PM141139 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 May 87 First Edition p 3

[Georgiy Kuznetsov "Cambodian Reportage": "Return From Hell"]

[Excerpts] Phnom Penh, Moscow -- [Passage omitted] A WASHINGTON POST correspondent accompanying us in Phnom Pehn wrote recently: "The comments of people here -- whether they are hotel workers, state employees, or trishaw drivers, who pedal their 'taxis' along the city's streets -- are identical. They oppose Pol Pot. Almost everyone lost some relatives during his period of rule."

"Pol Pot will never return," said a young hotel employee, whose father and brother were murdered under the Khmer Rouge regime. "People hate him too much." [passage omitted]

Unfortunately there are countries, above all the United States, which openly help Pol Pot, who stands guilty of annihilating 3 million of his fellow citizens and who has now banded together in a coalition with former Prime Minister Son Sann and Prince Sihanouk. Together they call themselves "Democratic Kampuchea" which, disgracefully, is still recognized by the United Nations! The "Cambodian question" is constantly stirred up within that organization with a single aim in mind: to break the unity of the three Indochinese countries and to separate the PRK from fraternal Vietnam, which sent volunteers to help the Cambodian people expel the Pol Pot gangs from their territory and prevent their return.

"We are ready to begin talks on national reconciliation with any opposition forces, provided that the Pol Pot grouping is eliminated militarily and politically. Cambodia and Vietnam have agreed on the annual partial withdrawal which will be completed in 1990," PRK Health Minister Yit Kimseng told me when describing the situation in the country.

"Any faction apart from the Khmer Rouge may hold talks with us about the future government. We already have announced that we are ready to hold talks with other groupings on condition that Pol Pot is removed," Prime Minister Hun Sen explains, stressing that this presupposes the elimination of the political and military organization of the Khmer Rouge, who will then be accepted into Cambodia as "ordinary citizens." The PRK Government is prepared for dialogue with Prince Sihanouk, too, but his future will be resolved not during talks, of course, but by the country's people.

"Their dreams of overthrowing our authority with military assistance have been shattered," Hun Sen said in conclusion. "Even if we are prepared for talks, this does not mean that we are weak. We simply want to end the Cambodian people's suffering."

The military plans of the coalition entrenched in Thailand, a coalition in which the Pol Pot supporters with over 40,000 men under arms represent the main military force, were dealt a powerful blow during the 1984-1985 dry season. At that time, 16 major bases on Cambodian territory near the Thai border were destroyed.

However, neither the Army, which forms a reinforced zone along the entire border with Thailand, nor the local self-defense forces are lowering their vigilance. Precautionary measures are being taken: On the roads out of cities and large population centers barriers have been erected where soldiers are on duty in reinforced sentry posts and military patrols, and volunteer militia units are to be seen at the most important intersections in the capital after curfew begins at 8:30. [passage omitted]

Rice is the main crop. Some 1.72 million hectares are planted with rice now although the area suitable for rice is larger than that -- 2.5 million hectares. [passage omitted]

"After the liberation from the Pol Pot regime's power in January 1979, the country starved. Rice production was minimal. In 1984-1985, we were afflicted by serious droughts. Nevertheless, the per capita harvest averages 280-350 kg annually. The country is no longer hungry. However, there isn't enough rice, especially because the Khmers have a liking for it and we eat little meat. Rice and fish -- that is the people's diet," Health Minister Yit Kimseng told me.

Grain production was discussed by the leaders of Phnom Penh district in Kandal Province, which encircles the capital. Each family in this district has sold the state between 50 and 300 kg of rice on a voluntary basis. In addition, there is a material interest in this: In exchange, the state supplies kerosene, salt, sugar, matches, fabrics, crockery, fertilizers, and plows at firm prices -- that is, very low prices. Unfortunately, the state clearly has a shortage of these commodities and peasants sometimes are reduced to subsistence farming.

"The party organization is trying to help the authorities to fulfill the grain production and harvesting plans. We inspire the people, we explain the causes of the disruptions and the difficulties, and we look for ways to eliminate the shortcomings," said Iyeng Liyeng [name as published], head of a party committee office in the district, which has 18 party cells and 83 members of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party [KPRP]. Their most immediate support comes from the 70 "activist groups" consisting of 657 people who are preparing for party membership.

Of course, this is merely a drop in the ocean measured against the district's 57,000 inhabitants. In a country of 7 million people there are just over 14,000 party members and 51,000 "activist group" members. "But it must not be forgotten that at the time of liberation from the Pol Pot gang there were just 62 KPRP members. Now the party even has a reserve: The League of People's Revolutionary Youth (Komsomol), with 44,000 members, and the Association of Revolutionary Youth (the organization's first stage), to which around 800,000 young men and women belong.

In some areas the young republic's successes are unquestionable. Illiteracy has virtually been eliminated. Despite the fact that at the time of liberation there were just 45 doctors of various types (Pol Pot's men tried to wipe them out), the country has now created a health care system which extends to villages and hamlets. In April there was a mass inoculation of the population against five diseases, including malaria and polio.

The Cambodian people are now working to fulfill the plans of the 2d year of the first 5-year plan in the country's history. However, the strategic tasks are broader; they are the struggle against the enemies, the development of production, and the creation of revolutionary forces by building up the party in the mass social organizations. Resolving them is the guarantee of the progress of People's Cambodia.

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN PRK; SIHANOUK 'SILENT PROTEST'

BK170908 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1330 GMT 16 May 87

[Text] Various news agencies have reported that in July this year, a meeting -- a so-called International Conference on Cambodia -- will be convened in Bangkok. According to our observer, this kind of plan is unbelievable for as far as the situation goes, it is a most insolent interference in the affairs of the Cambodian people, who have not asked anyone to discuss their problem. History has shown that the Cambodian people are capable of determining their own destiny.

Prominent among those organizing this so-called conference, as was reported, are some non-governmental organizations. However, it should be concluded that, whether one likes it or not, behind these organizations are real and powerful forces. These forces have been supplying the financial means to carry out sabotage against the PRK. Militarily, these forces have been supplying weapons and ammunition to the Pol Pot bandits, who have bases and refuges in Thailand. In the international arena, these forces have been striving to bolster the already shaky position of groups of exiled Cambodians within the so-called Coalition Government for Democratic Kampuchea [CGDK].

We want to refer primarily to the Washington administration, an administration which has made efforts to bring up all kinds of issues relating to Cambodia in an attempt to achieve a real aim. Washington wants to hinder the tendency toward dialogue, which is vigorously developing, to resolve differences in the region, including differences concerning the Cambodian problem. It is not by accident that these people have started to noisily carry out their maneuvers to convene in Bangkok an international conference on Cambodia. This coincides with the time when some ASEAN leaders are resolutely denouncing the Pol Pot clique and at a time when another round of talks between the foreign ministers of Vietnam and Indonesia in Hanoi is being planned.

As for the hopes these outside influences have pinned on the so-called Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea [CGDK], the true situation has already reflected this. As reported a few days ago by a Bangkok paper, THE NATION, the head of this coalition government, Norodom Sihanouk, sent letters to a number of capital cities informing them of his decision to take a one-year leave from this position. He explained that this decision was taken as a symbolic protest against the Pol Pot Group, which recently attacked his men. So, this is the real unity of the CGDK. In fact, it is not the first time that one hears of reports of arms clashes among various groups in this coalition government. Based on this kind of report, THE NATION last year wrote that the coalition government was almost finished. Judging from Sihanouk's statement, the situation has deteriorated since then. The Pol Pot group, with the support of outside forces, has become more and more arrogant and insolent. Furthermore, it is difficult to expect anything from the number one criminals, who have been condemned to death by the people for their genocidal policy and who are trying to escape revenge.

In a recent interview, Sihanouk also said the Pol Pot group cannot change its true nature, even after Pol Pot's death. Support for Pol Pot, who is hiding under the CGDK label, is hindering the solution to problems relating to Cambodia. In fact, a real basis for this solution already exists, that is the proposal of the three Indochinese countries which calls for negotiations with the ASEAN countries. Reflecting the Indochinese countries' goodwill is their readiness to examine various proposals from the ASEAN countries.

SOKOLOV, KARPATI ADDRESS JOINT ARMED FORCES MEETING

LD211833 Moscow TASS in English 1755 GMT 21 May 87

[Text] Budapest May 21 TASS -- A meeting of fraternity in arms of Soviet and Hungarian army men has been held at the Lajos Kossuth Higher Military School in the city of Szentendre. The meeting was attended by Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Sokolov, USSR defence minister, who is currently on an official friendly visit in Hungary.

Addressing the meeting, Sergey Sokolov stressed that the USSR and the other countries of the socialist community had repeatedly warned that they will not allow under any circumstances military superiority over them. Nobody should harbour any illusions about that.

Our military-political alliance -- the Warsaw Treaty is the reliable shield of socialist gains and peace on earth. In the present-day complicated international situation a high degree of combat preparedness of the armed forces of our fraternal socialist countries is important. Nothing should take us unawares. And our armed forces will do everything so that the peaceful labour effort of the Soviet and Hungarian peoples, the peoples of all countries of the socialist community be reliably protected.

Colonel-General Ferenc Karpati, Hungary's defence minister, said that the forces of imperialism have not abandoned their attempts at gaining unilateral superiority. The Soviet Union is pursuing a consistent peaceable policy, which meets with broad response in the hearts of people. The proposals put forward by the USSR in the field of disarmament are evidence of the Soviet Union's new approach to international security issues. The USSR's peaceable policy contributes to the growth of the prestige and strengthening of the positions of socialism in the international arena.

PRAVDA REPORTS HONECKER-MEDVEDEV MEETING IN BERLIN

PM201141 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 May 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meeting in Berlin"]

[Text] Berlin, 18 May -- E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, received V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, here today.

During the talk E. Honecker provided information on the successful implementation of the decisions of the 11th SED Congress and the broad program of events in the GDR to mark the 70th anniversary of Great October, which opened a new stage in mankind's development.

V.A. Medvedev talked about the efforts of the CPSU and the Soviet people in implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress aimed at accelerating the country's socioeconomic development and restructuring all spheres of life.

The SED, the GDR leader said, supports the Soviet people's great work in implementing the course of the 27th CPSU Congress. The successes of Lenin's party and the Soviet people wholly accord with the GDR's interests and with the interests of socialism and world peace. Together with the other Warsaw Pact states the SED and the GDR will continue to do everything to contribute to strengthening peace and equal security for all.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON CHIRAC OFFICIAL VISIT

Chirac Sees Academy of Sciences

LD151306 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 15 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 15 TASS -- Prime Minister Jacques Chirac of France today visited the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR where he met Soviet scientists.

The guest was welcomed by Guriy Marchuk, president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. Dwelling on the role of scientific achievements in society's progress, he said that there existed a good deal of problems which were common to the whole of mankind but whose solution was beyond the strength of even a highly developed state.

The international character of science presupposed intensification of exchanges in the results of scientific activity among scientists in various countries and, moreover, the pooling of efforts in coming to grips with individual problems on a bilateral basis or with global problems on a multilateral one.

In view of this, Marchuk recalled that throughout its history the academy has maintained close ties with French scientists. The Soviet Academy of Sciences has extensive scientific contacts with French scientific institutions and scientists also today. The joint work covers, among others, such areas as peaceful exploration of space, mathematics, astronomy, astrophysics, the physics of high temperatures and chemical physics.

Over 50 joint projects and experiments were implemented over the year of cooperation in space research. One should make a particular note of the "Vega" project in which France took as active part. Soviet and French cosmonauts accomplished the joint space mission. Preparations are in progress for the second flight.

At the same time, I would like to note, Marchuk went on, that international scientific cooperation, being an integral part of inter-state relations, hinges to a considerable extent on the state of political relations between them. For this reason, he said, turning to the prime minister of France, we hope that your visit to our country and our academy will serve the cause of improving Soviet-French bilateral relations, including in the field of science.

Jacques Chirac said in his reply remarks that it was a great honour for him to speak to the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. I would like to give credit to the Soviet science which inherited great traditions and holds the leading place in world research in most varied areas, he said. I would like also to give credit to you at the point when renovation gets under way in your country under the impact of an impetus given by its leaders.

And indeed, under the programme launched by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet Union has embarked on the path of a large-scale policy of reorganization and modernization -- an undertaking which evokes great interest among international public and my fellow citizens, Jacques Chirac said.

Speaking about the impetuous development of science, he dwelt on moral-ethic and legal aspects of the application of scientific discoveries. He emphasized that the results of cognition should serve for the good and not to the detriment of man.

The guest spoke highly of the Soviet space research programme and said that France attached immense significance to cooperation in this field, of which the flight of the first French astronaut in 1982 was a concrete embodiment.

Jacques Chirac stressed the importance of international scientific cooperation in areas which affect the interests of Europe as a whole, such as, in part, environmental protection. He expressed the conviction that the policy of openness implemented in the Soviet Union would help increase this cooperation.

Jacques Chirac declared for multiplying contacts between the French and Soviet Academies of Science, for cooperation among scientists to contribute to the development of friendly French-Soviet ties.

Gorbachev Talks Demonstration

AU150920 Paris AFP in English 0910 GMT 15 May 87

[Text] Moscow, May 15 (AFP) -- Around 30 Soviet refuznik demonstrators were violently dispersed in front of the emigration offices here Friday as visiting French Premier Jacques Chirac started talks with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in the Kremlin.

The refuzniks, mainly Jews who have been refused emigration visas, demonstrated for about 15 minutes before plainclothes police provoked a scuffle between a crowd of hostile apparent passersby and the demonstrators.

The policemen jostled the refuzniks and tore apart streamers claiming the right to emigrate that the refuzniks had pinned to their clothes.

The crowd shouted anti-Semitic abuse at the refuzniks as plainclothes KGB officers filmed the demonstrators, who left the area after around 45 minutes.

Cries such as "Hitler should have killed you", "we defended you" and "we will tear you apart" came from the crowd. Witnesses have said that such crowds on previous occasions have been made up of plainclothes security agents.

One refuznik couple, Mr. and Mrs. Emmanuel Lourie, said they hoped Mr. Chirac would raise the emigration issue in his talks with Soviet leaders.

A spokesman for the refuzniks said they wanted to mark the Soviet Union day at the United Nations Friday with their demonstration.

In a speech after his arrival here for a three-day visit on Thursday, Mr Chirac raised human rights issues, including emigration.

Gorbachev, Chirac Discuss Ties

LD151824 Moscow TASS in English 1758 GMT 15 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 15 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev has met with French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac today.

The main part of the conversation centered on French-Soviet relations. They, Mikhail Gorbachev said, need considerable impulses in order to revive their former friendly character in full volume. We are against weakening them and believe that the USSR and France bear their share of great responsibility, especially at the present-day crucial stage of international development, and can do much positive. So far this is hampered by the hackneyed complexes and stereotypes of thinking. Jacques Chirac's attention was drawn to the fact that the Soviet public is following with perplexity and concern the increased manifestations of anti-Sovietism in France.

Jacques Chirac said that it is desirable to rectify French-Soviet relations through practical measures in the economic ties, in the field of scientific and cultural cooperation, and expressed some proposals.

A detailed exchange of views was held on disarmament issues, on freeing Europe from nuclear weapons, on the stand taken by the NATO member countries and the international public as regards the Soviet Union's initiative on medium- and shorter-range missiles. Mikhail Gorbachev voiced the hope that the French leadership would make a constructive contribution to the search for agreements that would enable the first, decisive step towards real disarmament, to which all peoples are looking forward and which would facilitate the attainment of a radical positive turn in all world politics.

At the request of the French prime minister, Mikhail Gorbachev summarised the principles, aims and methods of implementation of the ideas of reorganisation, which will put socialism step-by-step to a qualitatively new level through democratising the society. This is a difficult task, and the main effort still lies ahead. We have many things to do. Thus we have a lot of business to attend to at home, and the USSR's foreign policy will fully accord with the character of the internal processes and their creative aims, mirror the Soviet society's vital requirements.

Reorganisation is development in the new conditions of the socialist choice made by our people in 1917. New thinking includes the recognition of every people's right to its own, independent choice. And history will make the judgement whose choice is better. It is good that all of them are different. This is even an impulse for development and is fully in keeping with Marxist dialectics (the unity of opposites), on which the concept of coexistence, of peaceful competition is based.

Jacques Chirac wished every success to the reorganisation and described it as a striking, impressive phenomenon, which is seen as the most important event late this century. He voiced hope that it would bring about a bettering of East-West relations. He declared for a new climate in French-Soviet relations.

Other issues were touched upon, including the question of world-wide significance -- of eradicating poverty in a vast part of the world and the need for new "North-South" relations.

The conversation was straightforward and frank, which made it possible to compare the views and stands. It was useful for the development of Soviet-French political dialogue, and, as Mikhail Gorbachev said in conclusion, both you and we have that to think about in connection with its results.

Taking part in the meeting were Eduard Shevardnadze, French Foreign Minister Jean-Bernard Raimond, Ambassadors Yakov Ryabov and Yves Pagniez, advisor to the Prime Minister Francois Bujon de l'Estang.

Development, Disarmament Viewed

LD152151 Paris International Service in French 2030 GMT 15 May 87

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Jacques Chirac says that his talks with Gorbachev have cleared up some misunderstandings with regard to bilateral relations, but positions still differ in the disarmament sphere. Concerning the zero option on short-range missiles for instance, France, which does not possess them and which is not a member of the NATO integrated command, does not feel concerned. But I leave you to listen to what Chirac said on another issue, that of development:

[Begin Chirac recording] I recalled the situation of the developing countries indicating that France is ready to discuss these problems with the Soviet Union. We are very worried about the increasing poverty of many developing countries, their debts, and the fluctuation of commodity prices. We are aware that it is not one single country -- whichever it is -- which can provide an answer to this problem. Only an initiative coming from industrialized countries, countries with a high standard of living and a large income, can find an answer to these problems. It is not a French-Soviet affair; it is an issue which should involve all industrialized countries, and this is perhaps a sphere which could positively overcome the existing contradictions in East-West relations. [end recording]

More on Gorbachev-Chirac Talks

LD151853 Paris Domestic Service in French 1700 GMT 15 May 87

[Text] This morning the prime minister met Soviet Academician Andrey Sakharov for a few minutes, who denounced the halting of the process of releasing prisoners of conscience in the USSR. He also mentioned to Jacques Chirac the problem of a family wanting to emigrate to France. Jacques Chirac told him that the matter and the cases which he had just mentioned were present in his thoughts.

Afterward Jacques Chirac met the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev at the Kremlin for more than 4 hours of talks, at the end of which Mr Chirac said what he thought about his interlocutor, Mr Gorbachev.

[Begin Chirac recording] I really have the feeling that Mr Gorbachev is someone with whom one can talk. One has the feeling that he is a man whom one can persuade, and who can persuade us, so a real dialogue can be established. I will not hide from you the fact that this is not the impression I left with after my previous talks with Soviet leaders. He has the willingness, without any doubt the intelligence, and the capacity. He has a team. He is developing a policy that certainly corresponds to a need. These are a lot of assets. The future will tell what we should think about this, but in any case he convinced me of his willingness to make things move, which is important. [end recording]

During the 4 and 1/2 hours of Chirac-Gorbachev talks, the internal development of the USSR was discussed as well as disarmament. On this latter point, Jacques Chirac stressed that differences remain between France and the USSR. Here is our correspondent in Moscow, Ralph Pinto:

[Begin Pinto recording] When one wants to talk seriously one has to take one's time. So, one settles in, and if one is not dining, then one orders tea.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Jacques Chirac ordered tea four or five times during the 4 and 1/2 hours of talks at the Kremlin to discuss Gorbachev's Soviet Union. Jacques Chirac listened to the head of the Kremlin discussing his reforms which are under way, reforms which he wants to be very deep and to take place at a fairly rapid rate, Chirac said, who added, of course, all within a very strict framework of a socialist orientation.

The large chapter on disarmament and the French deterrent was opened, a disarmament which one must measure in terms of security. France is motivated by its European feelings, Jacques Chirac said, adding, with a French attitude, that this includes working together with the FRG. Basically, this is nothing new, but Gorbachev said this exchange gives you and us something to think about. We understand that we are not here to convert those we are talking with, but we must talk. We also must talk to clear up political misunderstandings between Moscow and Paris. An observation from Jacques Chirac illustrates the whole matter: A lively and fast meeting with immediate reactions. [end recording]

Still on the subject of Jacques Chirac's visit to Moscow, we note that PRAVDA has censored part of the speech which he made yesterday evening at the Kremlin. PRAVDA omitted all references made by Jacques Chirac to prisoners of conscience and to the emigration of Soviet Jews.

Chirac Meets Dissidents

AU161454 Paris AFP in English 1138 GMT 16 May 87

[Text] Moscow, May 16 (AFP) -- French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac told a group of dissidents and refuzniks early Saturday that Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev had refused to discuss the Soviet human rights issue with him, the dissidents said. During the hour-long breakfast with the 14 dissidents at the French Embassy here, Mr. Chirac discussed the fate of Soviet prisoners of conscience, and several dissidents told him that the release of political prisoners had picked up, "but very slowly."

On Friday, Soviet dissident Andrey Sakharov had told Mr. Chirac that the release of Soviet prisoners of conscience had stopped. According to Sergey Grigoryants, a dissident freed last February, between 150 and 160 prisoners have been released since then, up from 127 last month. Some dissidents said Mr. Chirac's visit and Western pressures contributed largely to provoking the latest releases.

Among those present at the breakfast was Aleksandr Bogoslovskiy, a prisoner sentenced in 1984 for distributing illegal publications, released three days earlier after the French Embassy invited his wife to the breakfast. He did not appear in good health.

Another guest, Lyuda Evsyukov, whose brother is detained in Siberia, said Mr. Chirac indicated he would believe in the "democratization process" undertaken by Mr. Gorbachev when it happened spontaneously and not under Western pressure.

Also attending the breakfast were Larissa Bogoraz, widow of the late dissident Anatoliy Marchenko who died in prison last December, the Orthodox priest Gleb Yakunin, and Mrs. Ida Nudel, the Jewish militant who moved to Moldavia when refused permission to live here. "I consider myself in forced exile there; I lived 47 years in Moscow and now I don't have the right to," Mrs. Nudel said. "It is the West that is keeping me alive," she added.

Vladimir Slepak, a Jewish refuznik who has been wanting to emigrate to Israel since 1970, said the meeting with Mr. Chirac was "moving."

Another former prisoner, Lev Timofeyev, gave the French prime minister his prisoner's uniform -- a quilted grey jacket and a cap. "We got the impression our problem was close to his heart," said Mrs. Tania Edelstein, whose husband Yuliy, 29, was released ten days ago and is living in Moscow without official permission to do so.

Mr. Grigoryants called the meeting "extremely useful because it was the first of a kind." He said Mr. Chirac told them Mr. Gorbachev's response to questions on the human rights issue was, "You should hand me a list."

Ariane Case 'Petition'

LD161606 Moscow TASS in English 1549 GMT 16 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS -- Jacques Blot, director of the European Department of the French Foreign Ministry, has refused today to receive the letter from Lyudmila Varygina's (Verdier's) sister and brother addressed to Jacques Chirac demanding that the French authorities withdraw the unfounded charges against Lyudmila Varygina (Verdier) of involvement in the Ariane affair and give her an opportunity to come to the Soviet Union.

Jacques Blot motivated his refusal by the argument that the "case of Varygina (Verdier)" is within the competence of the French judicial authorities. In answer to the just demand of Varygina's sister Irina Sarksyian that the French authorities should apologise in public for the injustice done to her and compensate to Lyudmila Varygina the moral and material damage, Jacques Blot answered that if a person is not convicted in France, he is considered to be not guilty and consequently no moral damage had been done to Lyudmila Varygina (Verdier).

At the same time, it is known to all that first Lyudmila Varygina had to spend 18 hours in a cell together with criminals, without any charges being made against her. Then she spent 17 days in prison, and the French authorities did not allow her to inform the Soviet Embassy about her whereabouts. Now she is subjected to a humiliating procedure twice a week -- registering herself by an investigating officer while being actually under house arrest.

The relatives of Lyudmila Varygina (Verdier) sought a meeting in Moscow with French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac, who is currently staying here. Yet the head of the French Government, who is currently on an official visit here, had no time to meet with the Soviet citizen's relatives. At the same time, Jacques Chirac, who was staying in the embassy building while Varygina's (Verdier's) relatives were received there, did find an hour of time, he is so much short of, to have a luncheon today with a group of persons named dissidents in the West.

Together with Lyudmila Varygina's relatives, a group of city soviet deputies arrived, at the request of the local public, in Moscow from Yaroslavl, where Varygina lived prior to her marriage. Yet they were denied reception. Today they went to the embassy to hand in a petition from the public of the city of Yaroslavl addressed to Jacques Chirac. It was only after a long procrastination that an embassy official, who refused to give his name, accepted from them a letter in which the public of Yaroslavl demands that the good name of Verdier family be restored.

The "case" of my sister's involvement in the stealing of an Ariane rocket has been trumped up and the charge made against her is false, Irina Sarksyian said after the conversation. All this is somebody's malicious intrigue spearheaded first and foremost against Soviet-French relations. My sister is an honest and decent woman. And we have sound reason to demand her release.

Chirac Moscow TV Interview

LD162240 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1925 GMT 16 May 87

["Special program": Interview with French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac by Soviet television political observer Georgiy Zubkov, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator Pavel Kasparov, and APN political observer Aleksandr Ignatyev, in Moscow on 16 May -- recorded; Chirac's remarks in French with superimposed official translation in Russian by French side, according to screen caption]

[Text] [Zubkov] Prime Minister, without doubt this interview will arouse great interest among our viewers. We hope that it will help create a still better understanding and assessment of France's position both in matters concerning bilateral relations and in matters concerning European and world politics. Permit me to introduce my colleagues: All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator Pavel Kasparov, APN political observer Aleksandr Ignatyev, and myself, television political observer. By the way, all three of us in our time have worked as correspondents in Paris.

Your visit, Prime Minister, is drawing to a close. How do you assess the results of the talks in Moscow and the results of the meeting with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev? We know that both sides agreed during the talks that our relations are currently not as they have been nor as they should be. In your opinion, was a new impetus given to Soviet-French relations?

[Chirac] In the first place, I would like to say publicly that I express to the Russian people as a whole my gratitude, my gratefulness, to the Soviet authorities, the general secretary, the head of government, and all those whom I have met for the wonderfully organized trip and for the very pleasant reception. Apart from this I had very meaningful conversations.

It is true that Franco-Soviet relations are not as they used to be at the time of General de Gaulle. It is true that both sides have the desire and will to improve this situation. I think that my trip has given a new impetus, because it has enabled us to understand each other better on issues where misunderstandings have arisen, because in the coming weeks and in the coming months there will be a number of exchanges, which in individual areas will make it possible to give concrete expression to this invigoration, to which we aspire, both Frenchmen and Russians, to our bilateral cooperation.

[Zubkov] The translation is finished.

Now permit me to move on to matters of European politics. It is proposed -- at least the French press writes that it is -- that by the end of the month it is possible that there will be a common position of the West European countries with regard to the Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles. What do you think? Will such a position promote the reduction of nuclear weapons on the continent, and what will France's role be?

[Chirac] You know, the most important thing for us is that disarmament should be conducted in conditions that strengthen security. What is the situation at the present time? In the United States there are approximately 10,000-12,000 nuclear warheads. In the Soviet Union there are 10,000-12,000 nuclear warheads. All of this could fall on Europe, in Europe. Something of the order of 600 nuclear warheads is a lot, but not on the same scale. So our first concern is to reduce U.S. and Soviet strategic weapons. We welcomed the proposal for a 50-percent reduction, which would return us to the situation that existed 10 years ago. We would like it to progress further and more quickly.

Then there are the medium-range arms. An accord was reached about the withdrawal of the U.S. Euromissiles and the Soviet SS-20's. Splendid! Now it is proposed that we go further. We say that it is a European matter, which is not a French matter because we do not belong to NATO, that we do not have these missiles on our territory, we do not have U.S. arms in France. But, on the other hand, because France is in Europe, we want to have a position of solidarity with our European friends and neighbors, and we would be worried if Europe was suddenly completely disarmed between these two gigantic arsenals, which can threaten it, of course, and this is in a context in which in Europe itself there is a huge difference between the Warsaw Pact forces and the Western democracies' forces, whether they belong to NATO or not, as in the case of France. So this worries us, and we say that one must be careful. This question has to be considered in depth, and Europe's security must be guaranteed.

[Zubkov] Indisputably, it must be considered in depth and with thoroughness, but the main thing is to shift from this spot, and to begin this process, in my opinion. What do you think?

[Chirac] The process has begun; it began in Reykjavik, it is continuing; that is -- the talks between the Americans and the Soviet Union. Since it touches upon our security, we are of course following this development, and we have constant coordination with the heads of European governments in order to elaborate this common question, a common reply to the question asked by Mr Shultz after his trip to the Soviet Union. I was particularly pleased to sum up the situation with Mr Gorbachev on these problems with the purpose of giving him a better explanation of the French position, because of course, it is a sphere in which opinion changes, depending on the geographic position. That's quite natural.

[Kasparov] If you will allow me, I would like to touch on an issue: France's attitude to the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative of the Reagan administration. It is known that, officially, Paris does not support this initiative. However, a number of French firms nevertheless are taking part in (?all this). So, how, in your opinion, could the difference, strictly speaking, in the position of France, which has not signed an official document on cooperation in preparing the Star Wars program with the United States, and the position of those countries which have signed it, be explained? Is there a difference, in fact, in your opinion?

[Chirac] I'll explain France's position in one word. France accepts perfectly well the fact that research should be carried out, as does the Soviet Union. If French firms are interested in the field of research and development, let them take part in it. This does not pose any difficulties. On the other hand, France is against the deployment of antimissile systems in space. That is the reason why it has refused to support this initiative. France's position is as follows: to support the preservation of the ABM Treaty on antimissile weapons. It says that this accord must be observed, and if it is changed, it must be done with the common assent of the United States and the Soviet Union. France's position is clearcut: We do not want deployment in space.

[Ignatyev] Allow me, Mr Prime Minister, to ask you about nuclear tests. You probably know that we consider that an end to nuclear testing would help to ban the development of and to eliminate, in the final reckoning, nuclear weapons. We had a moratorium, which, unfortunately, the United States did not support. With regard to France, it is conducting tests in the Pacific Ocean, and some 80 such tests have been carried out there, despite protests from the population. The local population is addressing protests to you, and even has set up a nuclear-free zone there. Paris, it would appear, does not heed the population's protests.

[Chirac] Let me note that the Soviet Union is still undertaking and quite recently undertook nuclear testing, and we did not protest.

We have a nuclear deterrent force which is very modest -- we have 300 nuclear warheads, in comparison with the 12,000 warheads of the United States and the Soviet Union. So we do not intend to fall behind. We do not intend to attack anyone. This is not an offensive force, but we want to have a deterrent force to ensure that no one bothers us. Thus we regard it as necessary -- just like others, as you are doing in the Soviet Union and as the Americans are doing -- to modernize our nuclear force. We are doing this, and we shall do this, whatever the views of various people. To modernize we have to conduct tests. We have not achieved the level of sophistication of the United States or the Soviet Union, which are continuing their tests. We also are continuing them on French territory. You talk of protests. They do not come from the territory French Polynesia. The population of French Polynesia recognizes that the nuclear tests represent no danger. The protests come from distant countries, far removed from the Pacific region. They are political in nature. Whatever the protests, we shall continue our nuclear tests while it remains necessary to modernize our independent force, which is not an aggressive but simply a defensive force.

[Ignatyev] Perhaps it would make sense for all three -- the United States, the Soviet Union, and France -- to stop.

[Zubkov] And other countries!

[Chirac] We will stop when the United States and the Soviet Union have the same number of nuclear warheads as we, then we will stop; we will even cease [prekratim] our nuclear force.

[Zubkov] Awkward though it is for me to question what you say, you are not correct, because there was an official protest from New Zealand, among others, over the last explosion, held on 6 May. Isn't that so?

[Chirac] Yes, yes. There is an official protest from New Zealand whenever there is a blast. But I would like to note that we are the only country in the world, the world, that carries out nuclear tests and invites scientists from around the world -- from New Zealand and Australia among others to attend and to be able to look at everything, to see everything at our nuclear blasts, and then to produce a public report on what they think. A report was compiled, and it said in clear-cut terms that our blasts are clean; that is, they cause no difficulties or problems for anyone. I am waiting for the United States, the Soviet Union, and China to carry out the same experiment, to show the same openness [glasnost], as you call it, and to invite all interested scientists to attend the tests.

[Ignatyev] So your attitude to our moratorium was favorable. I mean our moratorium on atomic blasts.

[Chirac] I am not asking for anything as far as nuclear blasts are concerned, and I ask that I should not be asked for anything either.

[Zubkov] Let me refer to France's attitude to another, no less dangerous weapon -- chemical weapons. Why is it that France has decided to commence production of binary chemical weapons at precisely the time when talks on a convention to ban and subsequently scrap them in Geneva have entered a decisive phase.

[Chirac] You know, we are against chemical weapons. We support a verifiable ban on the existence of chemical weapons. But at the moment there are countries that have enormous stocks of chemical weapons -- the Soviet Union among others. That is a fact.

The Soviet Union says good, we will destroy them, we will get rid of them. That is marvelous, bravo. But, while we wait for them to be scrapped, we do not want to be

deprived of the means others have, insofar as we do not intend to attack anyone. We have modest means of deterrence; this is only a deterrent. We produce chemical weapons in sufficient quantities for a deterrent, not for aggression. What we have is very modest in comparison with the Soviet arsenal. The day when there is a verified removal, a verified elimination of chemical weapons, we will be the first to scrap our weapons. I formally promise that then we will be at a zero level like the others -- simultaneously.

[Zubkov] Prime Minister, you were able to find out on the spot here in Moscow about the restructuring taking place in our country. In our view its implementation is having a positive effect on relations with other countries. How do you think this could, in particular, influence the further development of Soviet-French economic and trade relations?

[Ignatev] With your permission I also will ask you about the possibilities for the development of scientific relations between the Soviet Union and France at a time when a further French crew is undergoing training at Zvezdnyy Gorodok, which will fly into space with Soviet cosmonauts, we hope?

[Chirac] As French people we -- or, I would say more broadly, we Europeans in general -- follow with great interest and understanding the experience of restructuring, with great interest. [repeats himself] We consider this to be an extremely positive development, which is useful for the Soviet Union. It is a great aspiration and we wish it success.

As regards relations with the West, there are two consequences. The first consequence is political. It is a positive consequence which certainly will enable the conditions of mutual trust to be improved through openness. The second consequence is economic. It should enable a more significant development of exchanges. With this reform the Soviet Union will produce more, export more, import more and take part more extensively in major international economic movement, and this is in the general interest of the Soviet Union and others. Thus I wish success to this experiment which we approve and which interests us.

In the scientific field, yesterday I visited the famous and outstanding Soviet Academy of Sciences, which I profoundly respect. I was received by a man whom I also greatly respect, President Marchuk, who will visit France; I officially invited him. There is already very wide scientific cooperation between France and the Soviet Union, which works marvellously in certain sectors, for example in space. You recalled the French cosmonaut who went into space for the first time, thanks to the Soviet Union. This cooperation goes further and is affecting many sectors. In certain sectors this cooperation is less intensive, as in oceanography and agronomy, and this cooperation should be made more active. We are making it more active between France and the Soviet Union, and this is the purpose of the visit by the president of the Academy of Sciences. I welcome this visit.

May I say that the result of restructuring externally -- naturally I am not talking about the internal consequences in the Soviet Union, as they will be wholly positive internally -- but outside the country in all probability it will improve the climate of trust, and you know that trust between the West and the East is the most important factor for peace. It is just as important as disarmament, and these two issues are related. It will be easier to achieve disarmament if there is trust. We get the impression in France and in Europe that the current evolution will enable trust to be increased. Herein lies the contribution of restructuring. I told the general secretary and the head of the government that there are certain aspects that allow trust to be strengthened.

I mentioned this at the meeting in the Kremlin. This concerns certain forms of applying and implementing human rights in the Soviet Union. This is a problem that, as you know, worries Europeans. I pointed out that within the scope of this openness, within the scope of this reform, an improvement in this area could accelerate and strengthen this phenomenon of trust, which is very important.

[Zubkov] At least there already are first results of restructuring [perestroyka], because you pronounce the word perestroyka in Russian excellently! We know that you have even translated Pushkin into Russian [as heard].

[Chirac] Unfortunately, that was a long time ago. I had forgotten. I translated Yevgeniy Onegin.

[Zubkov] Mr Chirac, in your speech at the Kremlin dinner you gave paramount importance to questions of human rights. The Soviet Union has made a proposal to convene an international conference in Moscow, whose participants could, in a frank discussion, examine issues of human rights in all their diversity. Nevertheless, the West, including France, does not respond to this proposal. Why?

[Chirac] This is a real problem, which should not be discussed just in terms of procedure. Of course I don't want to interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union, but you know that profound concern and passions exist in Western democracies with regard to the situation of a number of Soviet people. First and foremost this concerns prisoners of conscience, but also, on the other hand, the position of Jews who have not been given permission to leave freely. For us, in the West, this is incomprehensible. With this premise as a starting point very much is said, and I am convinced that the real situation is not that which has been explained. But that is not the problem; the problem is that there are men and women who are not free to leave their country and who can be arrested and placed in psychiatric hospitals because of crimes involving the expression of opinions. This is incomprehensible for Western people and arouses mistrust. For this reason I ventured to raise this problem in very friendly terms -- this was in no way aggressive -- and in the same spirit this morning I handed the prime minister a list of human rights cases, because I think that something should be done for moral reasons, for reasons connected with the dignity of man, but also for political reasons, allowing trust to be strengthened between East and West, and this is essential.

[Zubkov] Please do not consider my question to be aggressive either, not at all. I actually asked about this only because it would be possible at such a conference to discuss, in great detail, deeply and thoroughly, the whole complex of human rights problems. Indisputably, there exists in the West and here in the East different approaches and different opinions on what should be considered the main concerns of human rights. You have cited some problems. We could say that these are the right to work, the right to social security, the right to housing and so on, but probably for this there is some sense in us -- not us, but all of the states, I mean -- meeting together in order to finally settle these problems. This is why I asked you such a question.

[Chirac] Yes, I would like to give you a reply. A conference on human rights -- marvellous. In a situation where such a large number of problems exist, which also are perhaps problems of assessment in the Soviet Union, I am not quite sure that this would be psychologically the correct approach to the matter. Of course, if the Soviet authorities were to adopt a number of measures in the sphere of openness, in the sphere of their reform, in the sphere of democratization -- this is a great issue today in the Soviet Union -- if people were permitted to leave the country if they so wished, and if those who are in the camps because of expressing their views were released, this would alter everything and would create conditions of trust.

We could then, of course, talk about economic and social rights, or any other issues.

[Kasparov] Well, nevertheless, I would like, if you allow me, to return a little to the sphere of our economic relations. We have spoken about restructuring, about the fact that one can introduce restructuring in the Soviet-French scheme of things. Well, I know that during the talks the matter of setting up joint Soviet-French enterprises was examined. How do you view this matter as the head of the French Government? What can you see in this regard, so to speak, what prospects?

[Chirac] I have told you that we are very interested in the reform that is now being carried out in the Soviet Union. We are in favor of the prospect of joint enterprises and we will support -- that is, the French Government will support -- the policy of setting up joint enterprises. We decided this morning that Mr Kamentsev and the premier himself will come to Paris in the near future to explain to responsible officials and to business circles and the heads of the main firms how this movement will be implemented, because this movement already exists. There are already 40 French firms that are ready to join these joint enterprises. But some have understood this matter incorrectly. Thus we must develop information and give an impetus to these companies. We are for...

[Ignatyev, interrupting] You have spoken very correctly about the importance of trust between countries. On our part, we follow attentively the problem of human rights. We are very concerned about the fate of our fellow countrywoman, Varygina Verdier, whom you know, of course. The thing is that the authorities, in the same way as before, are not lifting the charges which, in our view, are groundless. This is a matter that is of concern to all Soviet citizens. I would even like, on behalf of us three, to address to you the question and request: Could you not use your influence to intervene in this problem, so as to put an end to this unseemly action?

[Chirac] You know, Mrs Varygina has not been charged -- she is completely free. She must simply remain in France to be available to the judicial authorities in connection with the investigation that is nearing completion. You are aware that in France there is a complete division between the executive authority, the legislative authority, and the judicial authority. You know France well, you know that the government cannot issue orders to the investigator. But if what the Soviet authorities have told me... [changes thought] if what was told to me by Mrs Varygina's family, who were received by the director of European Affairs in Moscow today, if all this is true, then this matter will be resolved very rapidly, with an announcement on the lack of evidence, and then Mrs Varygina can leave or stay.

[Kasparov] Mr Chirac, If I may: Unfortunately, this affair with Varygina Verdier has, altogether, unfolded against a background of a pretty serious anti-Soviet campaign. Soviet people, who have a sincere and profound respect for France -- recollections of the years when our peoples fought together against fascism are particularly dear to Soviet people -- Soviet people still cannot understand why from time to time such waves of unfriendly actions against our country roll through France. As journalists we receive many letters and questions on this topic. Could you, as the French prime minister, answer this question for the Soviet people? Could you say why the French authorities do not employ certain means in order in some way to prevent such anti-Soviet actions from being carried out, actions which sometimes assume very great dimensions?

[Chirac] It is possible that there have been misunderstandings, and I regret this. It is not correct, however, that anti-Sovietism exists in France, that it has recently manifested itself and that it is on a large scale. For many reasons, France has long-standing and deep-rooted relations of a historical and cultural nature -- I will not emphasize this -- and they appeared during the common struggle against fascism.

This morning, I was at the monument to the unknown soldier, and I laid a wreath before the Normandie-Neman plaque; there were a number of Soviet soldiers in the Normandie-Neman. We have not forgotten any of this.

However, certain phenomena have jarred the French people, have jarred the Europeans: The Afghanistan business, for example; deployment of SS-20's, when they were deployed it did not seem necessary to us -- but they are dangerous. There are a number of acts of that nature, and, of course, all the problems I mentioned earlier, connected with the situation of the Jews in the Soviet Union and the situation... [changes thought] You know, there remain two countries in the world where Jews are not allowed to leave the country: The Soviet Union and Syria. So, naturally, this arouses a reaction among the public. The history of the Gulag -- all this. One has to act in such a way that the positive aspects erase the negative aspects, and exert common effort. That was the point of my trip, and we will leave this country with a better understanding. The next time, you will not talk to me about anti-Sovietism.

[Zubkov] The main thing is that it shouldn't exist in France.

Mr Chirac, you are the prime minister and, at the same time, mayor of Paris. Allow me to address a question to you as mayor of Paris. What impression has Moscow made on you? What would you like to wish the people of Moscow and all Soviet people?

[Chirac] Allow me, as mayor of Paris, to extend friendly and cordial greetings to all Muscovites. I have invited the first among Muscovites -- their mayor -- with whom I was unacquainted, since there was a change in Moscow a year ago. I have invited him to Paris on an official visit and am happy about the fact that he accepted the invitation. I deeply regret that I did not have time to stroll around Moscow a little with my counterpart, the mayor of Moscow. It is a wonderful city; a city which is constantly changing, a city which has great charm. The mayor of Paris could learn a great deal from this city, as my friend, the mayor of Moscow, will be able to draw a great deal from Paris. So I regret that I was unable to spend whole day in Moscow with the mayor of Moscow. But I will return.

[Zubkov] We hope that you will come back after a shorter interval than the lengthy period of 10 years that has passed since you were here as prime minister.

Allow me to wish you a good flight. We know that you are leaving Moscow literally in a few hours time. Thank you for the interview. The facts about which you have spoken permit one to hope that your visit will indeed serve as some sort of breakthrough in improving our relations. At last, not only as correspondents who have worked in Paris but merely as people who know the views of our country and of our Soviet people -- we very much desire this. Thank you once again (?prime minister).

[Chirac] I warmly thank you, the Soviet press, and, in particular, the television, which have rendered us a number of services. Of course, I thank the Soviet authorities. I highly rate the quality of their reception and I am certain that this will lead to the results that we are striving for. I also greet and thank the Soviet people. [video shows Chirac, Zubkov, Ignatov, and Kasparov seated in armchairs around a table]

AFP on Coverage of Interview

AU162046 Paris AFP in English 2039 GMT 16 May 87

[Text] Moscow, May 16 (AFP) -- Soviet television on Saturday broadcast an uncensored version of a 40-minute interview with French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac, in which he criticized the "gulag" of Soviet labour camps, Soviet Jewish emigration policy and raised the problem of political prisoners in the Soviet Union.

The interview was broadcast at 11:30 p.m. (1930 GMT), several hours after Mr. Chirac left for Paris at the end of a three-day official trip to the Soviet Union.

Recent interviews with other Western officials have been shown roughly at the same time. Soviet viewers have thus heard British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher denounce the Soviet anti-missile defence system, and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz criticize the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan.

One question concerning Mr. Chirac's own contribution in general to "perestroika", or reconstruction, was cut out of the interview.

As Mr. Chirac was discussing the human rights issue, an announcement saying that his voice-over translator into Russian had been provided by the French ran across the screen.

TASS ran a ten-sentence long version of the interview in both English and Russian, saying simply that the French prime minister had expressed hopes for improved bilateral relations. He also said that current Soviet reforms would enhance the international climate, the official news agency said.

Friday's edition of the Communist Party newspaper PRAVDA cut out references to political prisoners and Jewish emigration made by Mr. Chirac in a banquet speech.

TRUD REPORTS DANISH TRADE UNIONISTS 4-7 MAY VISIT

PM111535 Moscow TRUD in Russian 8 May 87 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Visit Over"]

[Text] A delegation from the leadership of the Danish Central Trade Union Association headed by K. Christensen [initial as published], chairman of the Trade Union Center, was on an official visit to the USSR 4-7 May at the invitation of the AUCCTU.

The delegation was received by A.I. Lukyanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

A Soviet trade union delegation headed by AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev had talks with the Danish Central Trade Union Association delegation. The sides exchanged information on the activity of the two countries' trade unions. The Danish delegation was briefed on the most important tasks facing Soviet trade unions stemming from the decisions of their 18th congress, and on the participation of Soviet trade unions in the wide-ranging socioeconomic transformations taking place in our country.

The Danish Central Trade Union Association leaders talked about their organization's activity in safeguarding Danish working people's social and economic rights.

The participants in the talks devoted considerable attention to international questions since, they are profoundly convinced, the safeguarding of lasting peace and security is the most important prerequisite for successfully resolving the problems facing the trade unions in all other spheres.

The Soviet and Danish trade union representatives advocated the elimination of all types of mass destruction weapons and the refusal to site nuclear arms in space. They stated their support for efforts aimed at eliminating medium-range missiles and creating a nuclear-free zone in the north of our continent.

The sides welcomed the development of East-West trade and economic relations, which accords with the interests of working people and trade union members.

In their opinion, the international trade union movement could play a more active role in solving the problems of peace and disarmament, environmental protection, and the socioeconomic consequences of scientific and technical progress.

The AUCCTU and the Danish Central Trade Union Association will for their part promote the strengthening of mutual understanding and cooperation between the trade unions of East and West on these questions.

The AUCCTU and Danish Central Trade Union Association leaders expressed their desire to further develop bilateral trade union cooperation, which is an important element in strengthening trust and good-neighborliness between the Soviet and Danish peoples. Particular attention will be devoted to ties between sector and local trade union organizations and to the expansion of direct contacts between working people.

The guests also had talks at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade, at the central committees of a number of sector trade unions, and at the Leningrad Oblast Trade Union Council. They visited industrial enterprises in Moscow and Leningrad and had meetings with the trade union aktiv and with the leadership and aktiv of the Leningrad Department of the "USSR-Denmark" Society.

By common consent, the visit to the USSR by the delegation from the Danish Central Trade Union Association leadership was a success and marked an important step in developing relations between our countries' trade unions.

POGODIN WARNS OF POSSIBLE ESCALATION IN GULF

LD211442 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 21 May 87

[Aleksandr Pogodin commentary]

[Text] A missile attack on the American naval vessel Stark, damage sustained by the Soviet oil tanker Marshal Chuykov when it struck a mine, and air strikes against a Norwegian and an Indian tanker -- these events occurred almost at the same time. They underscored the grave danger of the situation in the Gulf area. So far no end is in sight to the Iran-Iraq war, which began more than 6 years ago and claimed over 1 million lives. The local shipping lanes that are vitally important to many nations are constantly endangered. An estimated 300 ships belonging to different countries have been attacked there since the war began.

Conclusions drawn from the situation are obvious. In the first place, the world community should exert joint efforts to gain a political solution to the Iran-Iraq war as soon as possible. Secondly, foreign interference in the internal affairs of local countries should be stopped, and the threat of military actions against them should be abandoned. These indisputable truths gain increasingly widespread recognition in the world, but not in the United States. Both President Reagan and Defense Secretary Weinberger have declared that a reduction in American military presence in the Gulf, demanded by many members of the U.S. Congress, is out of the question. Moreover, the commanders of American warships deployed in the area were ordered to open fire on any suspicious target.

In fact, the transition from the threat to use military strength to its direct use might take place any moment. The consequences of such development of events are unpredictable.

ABU DHABI PAPER: 'NEW WEAPONS' PROMISED TO SYRIA

JN201545 Abu Dhabi AL-ITTIHAD in Arabic 20 May 87 p 1

[Text] AL-ITTIHAD has learned that during their recent talks in Moscow, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev told Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad that the Soviet Union had agreed to equip Syria with new weapons to enable it to achieve strategic parity with Israel. The new weapons include 500-km medium-range SS-230 surface-to-surface missiles, modern T-80 tanks and 40 MIG-29 fighter planes, making the number of MIG-29 planes which the USSR has agreed to sell Syria 120 -- 40 of which have already been delivered. The new Soviet weapons also include additional numbers of SAM-11's, SAM-13's and SAM-14's. The number of Soviet experts and advisers in the Syrian Armed Forces will be increased to train the Syrians in the use of these new weapons.

Moscow has also agreed to reschedule the Syrian military debts to the USSR, which amount to \$15 billion. These will be paid within 25 years. The interests on these debts will be reduced and part of the old debts will be canceled.

MOSCOW COMMENTS ON U.S.-CHILE RELATIONS

PY220239 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2000 GMT 11 May 87

[Political commentary by Pedro Correa]

[Text] The United States is working at a fast pace in order to ensure the institutionalization of the fascist regime under the so-called 1980 Constitution. This simply means that the United States is trying to bar the reestablishment of a democratic regime of popular sovereignty. This past week, General John Galvin, a Pentagon chief, ended his most recent visit to the country to confirm his support for Pinochet. Simultaneously, the Department of State summoned to Washington the president of the Christian Democratic Party, Gabriel Valdes. We should ask if the State Department advised Valdes to accept the plans of the dictator.

Gen Galvin was the commander in chief of the U.S. Armed Forces in the Southern Hemisphere. In that capacity he had been in Chile a few months earlier, precisely on the eve of Pinochet's decision to remove the heads of a sector of the Army which was expressing discontent.

Gen Galvin now occupies a higher post in the NATO command. However, before he assumed this function, he suddenly made a trip to Chile. His most noteworthy activity was a long meeting with Pinochet, which Gen Galvin described as a military visit, a soldier-to-soldier talk. Without hesitation, he added that they talked about relations of the U.S. and Chilean military; the relations between the Armed Forces of the two countries; their experiences, doctrine, and training; and their efforts to obtain more from those relations.

It is significant that after meeting with military chiefs in Santiago, Gen Galvin went straight to Punta Arenas, where he had gone on his previous visit, thus revealing the importance he assigns to that area as a site of a U.S. military base and to the Chilean tyranny as a link in the axis that runs from racist South Africa, through the Malvinas, to the Pacific Ocean. What lies behind Gen Galvin's confession that the Pentagon seeks to obtain much more from its relations with the Chilean Armed Forces? His interest in Punta Arenas poses a threat to the independent Latin American and African countries, and his visit is nothing more than an immediate intervention in the affairs of the Chilean people, who are bravely struggling to reinstate a democratic regime.

What did Gen Galvin talk about on a soldier-to-soldier basis? What did he scheme about with his subordinate and puppet Pinochet? These maneuvers have to do with the fascist or profascist militarism which the Pentagon promotes as its most effective instrument against democracy, independence, and the vital interests of the Latin American people. This militarism is the number one enemy and the most direct threat to our republics. Not in vain did Galvin mention experience, doctrine, and training in the context of the relations between the Pentagon and the Chilean Armed Forces. The experience refers to the enactment of the fascist coup in 1973; the doctrine refers to the antipatriotic concept of national security, which is the internal war against the people; the training refers to the training of torturers, criminals, and repressive personnel in the U.S. schools for Latin American officers and noncommissioned officers.

Upon his return, Gen Galvin deliberately created confusion in the view of some; and, in the view of others, he exposed a plan by speaking of a plebiscite in 1988 and elections in 1989. In fact, Gen Galvin may have let it be understood that a new maneuver is under way.

The important thing is that he insolently gave military support, like a good imperialist chief, to the institutionalization of fascism based on the so-called 1980 Constitution.

In recent days, an officer of the Chilean Army, Major Armando Fernandez Larios, was sentenced by a U.S. court for a terrorist attack perpetrated in Washington while on active duty and on orders from his commander in chief, Augusto Pinochet. This attack resulted in the death of former Ambassador and Defense Minister Orlando Letelier. In addition to other aspects of the scandal, Pinochet exemplifies the kind of criminal whose bloody hands were shaken by Gen Galvin, and whose demeanor turned angelical when receiving the pope's blessings. Each officer of the Chilean Army must consider the trial for the assassination of Orlando Letelier, which fully reveals how they are used shamelessly by their commander in chief, the betrayer of President Salvador Allende.

Another aspect of this scandal is the state terrorism for which members of the Chilean Armed Forces are used, as movingly revealed by the counselor of the Lawyers College and legal adviser of the Vicariate of Solidarity in an interview that provided evidence against the armed bands like CODEMA [expansion unknown], Gurkhas, Chilean Anticommunist Action, and a number of commands which practice kidnapping, mistreatment, extortion, torture, and murder with impunity as instruments of the state. These groups are in fact made up of members of the Armed Forces who are protected by the military prosecutors and judges.

Gen Galvin went to Chile to support the regime. But the patriotic duty of every true Chilean is to put an end to the regime by means of social mobilization, mass struggle, and popular combativeness.

CPSU'S MEDVEDEV ADDRESSES WORKERS IN BAKU

Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 28 Apr 87 pp 1, 3

[Unattributed report: "Deepening and Accelerating the Restructuring: A Meeting Between the Workers of Sabirabadskiy Rayon and CPSU Central Committee Secretary, USSR Supreme Soviet deputy, V. A. Medvedev"]

[Text] Our country is witnessing the broad extension of work with historic scope, work unprecedented in the innovation and depth of the reforms in socialist society and expressed in the concept "restructuring." The need to carry out dynamic action and to take decisive steps to unmask everything that is preventing society from developing, and the warm approval and unanimous support provided by the Communist Party members and non-party members for the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee January 1987 Plenum and the Leninist foreign and domestic policy, were mentioned at a meeting that was held on 26 April in the rayon Palace of Culture between the workers of Sabirabadskiy Rayon and CPSU Central Committee secretary, USSR Supreme Soviet deputy, V.A. Medvedev.

The meeting was opened by V.M. Seidov, first secretary of the party's raykom.

Statements were made at the meeting by the following persons: Z.S. Aslanova, leader of a cotton-raising brigade on the Kolkhoz imeni 25 Bakinskiye Komissary, deputy to the AzSSR Supreme Soviet, hero of socialist labor; A. I. Ragimov, bricklayer at PMK-83 [Mobile Mechanized Column No 83]; A. Sh. Aslanov, member of the rayon Council of War and Labor Veterans; G. A. Abbasov, chairman of the Kolkhoz imeni Azi Aslanov; L. N. Kharitonova, teacher at the Aleksandrovskaaya Rural Secondary School, secretary of the primary party organization; and I. A. Akhadova, milkmaid at the Komsomol Kolkhoz. They expressed their profound gratitude to the CPSU and the Soviet Government for the concern for workers, and emphasized that the rayon's workers, like all the rest of the workers in the republic, are firmly resolved to make their contribution to the restructuring and to the acceleration of our country's socioeconomic development. The speakers mentioned the work being done in the rayon to fulfill the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, and shared their concerns and their unresolved problems with Medvedev.

V.A. Medvedev spoke at the meeting:

Dear comrades!

I would like, first of all, to express my gratitude to the rayon workers and to the residents of Sabirabad for the exceptionally cordial reception you have given to me and to K.M. Bagirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee. We have been in your rayon only a few hours, but we have had enough time to visit the commercial dairy farm on the Kolkhoz imeni A. Aslanov. We have visited the water-purification station, which is a very interesting project and a structure that is very important for your rayon. We also visited a school, became acquainted with the city, and talked with the residents. We are left with the impression that you are living rather well, that you are satisfied with your work, and you are striving to move on ahead.

During our meetings we heard expressions of approval and the unanimous support of our party's activities and the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the Central Committee January Plenum. All this will remain in our memory for a long time.

I would especially like to thank the comrades who have made statements today, for the warm words addressed to their deputy. Your critical comments are correct, and we shall attempt to carry out your wishes. All this evokes a sense of profound satisfaction with our meeting.

Every time one arrives in Azerbaijan -- and as a deputy one attempts to use the slightest opportunity to do this -- one senses the changes occurring here. The current year of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, as it were, obliges us, from the height of this celebration, to evaluate the scope and nature of that which has been achieved by our country and republic. The results are truly impressive. Suffice it to state that during the years of the Soviet authority the volume of industrial production in Azerbaijan increased by a factor of more than 200.

Azerbaijan not only retains great importance as our country's petrochemical center, but is also successfully developing such progressive branches as machine building, electronics, and instrument building, and is producing valuable types of agricultural output. National culture has received development and the scientific potential has increased. All this is very gratifying and has been achieved by the labor of people -- by your labor, comrades.

History does not know of any other examples of such a headlong flight from poverty and backwardness to the high level of the nation's standard of living and culture that our country has demonstrated. But our party and the Soviet nation are greeting the celebration of the Great October in complete conformity with the behests of V.I. Lenin -- not by congratulatory toasts, but by a realistic evaluation of the achievements and by the concentration of attention of which still has to be done. In this regard one is justified in asking the question: Are we using the potential that has been accumulated during the years of Soviet authority to the fullest extent?

The analysis of our country's socioeconomic development was carried out by the 27th CPSU Congress and subsequently by the Central Committee January 1987 Plenum has shown that that development requires acceleration on the basis of the profound restructuring of all spheres of social life.

The approach to this restructuring could not be worked out without getting a realistic idea of the complexity of the position in which the country proved to be without a critical analysis of the errors made in the past, without ascertaining the deepest causes of the negative processes. In essence, it was not until after the Central Committee April 1985 Plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress that the way was opened for an objective, critical study of the situation that had developed in our society, and the real conditions appeared for carrying out changes and positive reforms.

What did that analysis show?

As was noted by M.S. Gorbachev at the CPSU Central Committee January 1987 Plenum, in the late 1970's and early 1980's phenomena of stagnation arose and difficulties and unresolved problems began to accumulate.

A mechanism of economic retardation was formed, which led to a lowering of the growth rates for the national income during the last three five-year plans to less than half of the previous rates. But at such time there was also a dulling of the acuity in evaluating the true situation. Methods were invented for prettifying reality, and those methods gave rise to figure-padding. Instances of major figure-padding which were carried out when turning over cotton were revealed, as you know, both in your own Sabirabadskiy Rayon and in certain other rayons in the republic. There were violations of that very important principle -- distribution on the basis of the labor performed. While pledging yourselves to it verbally, we have actually gone farther and farther away in the direction of "egalitarianism," which has hurt not only the pocketbook, but also the dignity of those workers who could and wanted to work better.

There developed a segment of people whose purpose in life was summarized as the race for material prosperity, for personal gain. Instances of direct thefts and even those in major amounts were revealed in a number of republics and oblasts. That disease also affected Azerbaijan SSR, where criminals operated for many years in the cotton-ginning and local industry, in the services, and in trade. Even now that disease has not been completely overcome.

The question arises: How could such a thing occur in our society? The party has given an answer to that question which is honest, although a heavy one for the party: We ourselves, the administrative agencies and cadres, bear the blame for this.

In certain administrators one has seen a dulling of the sense of responsibility for the state of affairs the fear of looking reality in the face and speaking the language of truth. Ingratiating actions in the form of the mass issuance of awards and titles have created the appearance of success. One has seen an attraction toward measures taken for show purposes only and toward laudatory speeches. Propaganda work has dealt more with reminiscences and the past than with the vital problems of everyday life. The situation has required us to take effective steps, but we have limited ourselves to issuing appeals to carry them out.

A group of administrators who are outside the sphere of public criticism has been formed. Their infrequent meetings with the workers were held in a pompous atmosphere and were conducted in accordance with a previously scheduled scenario. A servile attitude toward one's superiors and nepotism flourished, and they led to the degeneration of the cadres. People became accustomed to these phenomena. People accepted them as the norm and our public awareness ceased reacting to them.

Things such as this could happen only under conditions of infringement upon openness, criticism and self-criticism, and control by the masses. Frequently no attempt was made to ask the people for their advice, or to listen to their voice. People's opinions were not taken into consideration. It turned out that our people are, as it were, "minors," who are insufficiently mature to be able to administer the country by themselves, or to develop the success of the October Revolution that was achieved by them.

Of course, a foreboding of disruption, and civil discontent, increased in the party and society. Many people realized that the time was long overdue to open the floodgates and wash out the slime that had accumulated over the course of decades, and to allow broad vistas for fresh ideas and for the living creativity of the masses. That was done after the CPSU Central Committee April Plenum.

It is no secret that in a few places people expressed doubts about the necessity for such a critical approach to evaluating the past years, to openness, and to democratic forms uncustomary for many. Certain people feel the call for discussions and polemics is capable of making the restructuring uncontrollable and of shaking loose the foundations of socialism.

The question of the party's attitude toward criticism at the present-day stage takes on special importance. The experience of the past has shown with sufficient clarity that the limitation, and especially the suppression, of criticism, the formation of restricted areas that are not to be seen by the people's eyes, and of a kind of caste of "untouchable" administrators, and rosy-hued propaganda that is only laudatory have been among the basic causes of the stagnation and undesirable tendencies in various areas of social life.

Yet a critical attitude toward one's own actions is, to use Marx's words, a law for every revolutionary party. The exacting, impartial evaluation of the errors of the past has, in the final analysis, a creative directedness.

That evaluation is necessary if we are to locate and decisively eradicate that which is hindering us from living and working properly. The truth clears the mind, it helps one to find a correct solution and to do one's job efficiently and knowledgeably. Without truth there is no justice, no civic spirit, no democracy. Without truth, high morality cannot exist.

The deeper the criticism of the previous mistakes and shortcomings, the more rapidly society can move to purify itself of them and the more strongly people will be convinced of the creative powers of socialism and its ability to overcome difficulties and move ahead. For the time being, from criticism, self-criticism, and openness, M.S. Gorbachev said in one of his statements, "We...have not lost, but have only won. The people have sensed an influx of strength, and they have become bolder, more dynamic, both on the job and in social life. You know, everyone who used to try to bypass our laws suddenly became silent. Because there is nothing stronger than the force of public opinion...."

Comrades, we are all witnesses of the way in which, thanks to the example of the honest and truthful attitude the party takes to the past and to affairs in society, we have succeeded in literally stirring up the masses, even those who previously used to be far from politics, and have succeeded in making them active participants in the restructuring in the outlying areas. The truth expands and reinforces its social base, and attracts to the resolution of the tasks of restructuring the chief character in society -- our Soviet nation.

That is what guided the Central Committee's Politburo when it came to the January Plenum with a thoroughgoing critical analysis of the errors of past years. That analysis was necessary to prevent the rebirth of the previous complacency and indifference, to reinforce the aroused need for radical changes, and to remove the definite lack of understanding still preserved in society, as well as within the party itself, concerning the complexity of the situation in which our country found itself.

The Central Committee January Plenum gave a new, powerful impetus to the reforms. In essence, the plenum completed the discussion about whether or not the restructuring is needed, reinforced the irreversible nature of the restructuring, and enriched and deepened its content. A factor of fundamental importance for all our work is the program developed by the January Plenum for democratizing all aspects of our society's life as a necessary condition for including all segments of the nation in the restructuring, as a guarantee that the errors made in the past will not be repeated and the job that has been begun will be brought to its end.

Comrades! The restructuring is a nationwide process that leaves not a single essential area of life uninvolved. Its center of gravity is however, in economics. Its success, in the final analysis, is determined by the real acceleration of the development of production and of scientific-technical progress. It is necessary to create those conditions that will stimulate technical progress, the improvement of the quality of output, and the best satisfying of needs, and will encourage the conscientious, initiatory worker and simultaneously punish the loafers, self-seekers, and unconscientious work.

The economic truths of the restructuring are simple. But they are backed up by the experience of management that has been accumulated over the centuries, and primarily our own socialist experience. Things will not start moving if the basic people on the job -- the workers and the peasants -- do not display a dynamic attitude in their work, if they do not begin to do their own work better.

But how do we achieve a situation in which people work better, in which they strive to show their best side in labor? First of all, of course, it is necessary to put an end to egalitarianism, to the fear of paying a person completely, all that he has earned. It is important only for wages to truly reflect the benefit being provided to society by the labor.

Principles that have been called upon to play a role of no small importance in this matter are the Leninist principles of cost accounting, with which the enterprises live and develop by using the honestly earned money, in accordance with the principle of paying their own way and of self-financing. Only in this instance will we see the formation in the production collectives of real responsibility for the quality of the output being produced, responsibility for their skills and for their miscalculations and errors. It is as an important reserve for encouraging economic socialist enterprise that we view the cooperative system today, whose opportunities were underestimated in the past.

Of course, nice earnings are not the only form of providing an incentive for a good worker, and for rewarding his conscientiousness and initiative. [paragraph continues]

Man does not live by bread alone. The higher the worker's education and his level of skills, the greater the need he has to have trust placed in him, to have society recognize his labor.

A powerful incentive to work well is economic independence. It is especially necessary to take this into consideration in agriculture. By its very nature, the peasant's labor is incompatible with "outside guardianship," with the need to follow petty regulations, or with rigid centralized methods of administration. Decisions linked with what should be done on the land can be made only by those who work on it. The peasant cannot work well when a checker is immediately following in his footsteps. The work is checked by the harvest itself, by the final result. I think that you know that more than anyone else.

That is why, in rural areas, it is desirable to encourage labor forms that leave more independence to the peasant. It is possible to employ on a broad scope, wherever this is justified by the production conditions, not only the brigade contract, but also family and individual cost accounting.

In the past we accumulated a large amount of experience in the brigade contract. It was used and is still being used successfully in industry and in agriculture. But for a long time we showed shyness toward family cost accounting. We were disturbed by the very fact of isolating the labor performed by one family from the collective's labor: Wasn't this a return to the past?

Those fears are unfounded. Any labor is of a socialist nature if it does not lead to the exploitation of another person, if it is carried out in conformity with a plan, and if it serves to raise the welfare of society. But, most importantly, if it is paid for on the basis of its real social benefit. Experience shows us that various forms of family production responsibility when growing labor-intensive crops not only does not undermine the principles of collectivism, but, on the contrary, contribute to the efficient running of the farm.

The January plenum set down specific measures that make it possible to expand the social base of the restructuring, to deepen its democratic nature. It would be possible to avoid many negative processes that are being criticized today if we were promptly to take the steps aimed at developing openness, criticism and self-criticism in society, and if the opinion of the people were taken into consideration more often.

The guarantee of the success of the restructuring lies in those democratic reforms that our party began after April 1985, in making the restructuring a mass, nationwide job. In history the only things that have been firmly established are the ones that reflect the interests of the nation as the creator of that history, the ones that are created by the nation voluntarily, thanks to its own participation and initiative. That is why today we are striving for a situation in which people actually become the owners of their country and their enterprises, and take more active part in the resolution of all questions. We proceed from the assumption that order in the home can be established only by a person who feels that he is the boss there.

We are taking the path of broad democratization not just to please anyone, although, of course, we have always been concerned about the attractiveness of socialism in the world. Democratization, as M.S. Gorbachev especially emphasized at the January plenum, is the inner need of developing socialist society. Socialism needs democracy like the air without which our restructuring will suffocate. Democracy serves the formation of conscious discipline and responsibility, since a person can be responsible only for what he consciously chooses.

The decisions of the January plenum represent not only the development of the ideas of the 27th CPSU Congress, but also the beginning of a new stage in the restructuring of the economy, the entire political system, and the work methods of the party itself. After January, meetings of the party aktiv and plenums were held in most of the republics, krais, and oblasts, and the press published a tremendous number of responses from Soviet citizens. The CPSU Central Committee received tens of thousands of letters expressing people's attitude toward the restructuring. Communist Party members and non-party members warmly approve the plenum decisions, comment on the depth of the analysis that the plenum made of our problems, and support the party's line that is directed at an open and truthful discussion with the nation. This is also well confirmed by our meetings with the workers of the city of Baku and your rayon that I have had recently.

The main issue now is, while continuing and deepening the analysis of the real problems in our development, to smelt the party policy and the energy of the restructuring into practical deeds, to achieve real shifts that can be felt by the nation, to achieve real results in economic development and especially in the social sphere. These are the areas to which we must now direct all our efforts, the entire political, organizing, and ideological work of the party organizations.

What can be said in this regard? What results have we already achieved and what problems lie ahead? Last year we achieved definite positive shifts in our country's socioeconomic development. Production developed more rapidly than planned. A good grain harvest was grown: we harvested 30 million tonnes more than the average annual level in the past 5-year plan.

The volumes of housing construction increased. We built more kindergartens and day-care centers, schools, clinics, hospitals, and institutions to meet cultural and everyday needs.

After steps were taken to reinforce discipline and combat drunkenness, there was a reduction by more than one-third in the sale of alcoholic beverages. For the first time since the 1960's there was a reduction in the number of accidents and the losses of work time. The crime rate in the country dropped by almost one-fourth. All this cannot fail to be gratifying. It is the result of the course developed by the 27th CPSU Congress.

However, the improvement of socioeconomic development did not become a steady tendency. In a recent Politburo session, and then at a session of the USSR Council of Ministers, there was a detailed analysis of the results of our country's socioeconomic development in the first quarter of this year. [paragraph continues]

At the Politburo session it was noted that in January and partially in February there had been a serious interruption in the work of machine building, light industry, and trade, resulting in a rather strained situation in the national economy.

The Politburo evaluated the reasons for the slump. It is not a matter of the severe winter, since other spheres that depend most of all upon the natural conditions -- the fuel-and-energy complex, the agro-industrial complex -- had worked more steadily. It is a matter primarily of omissions in economic and organizing work, of the insufficient knowledge of the fact that under the new conditions one cannot work with the old methods. Despite all the discussions and the steps taken, our cadres actually proved to be unprepared when the introduction of the new management methods began. Many enterprises in machine building were caught unaware by state acceptance, and yet a great deal had been said about the need for the timely and careful preparation for it. The introduction of state acceptance is supported by the nation and there will be no retreats here. It will be strictly carried out.

Light industry proved to be unprepared for work on the basis of production orders from the trade system, resulting in light industry's failure to ship a large amount of output and to fulfill the plan for retail commodity turnover. But here, as well, there will be no retreats. Light industry must work for the consumer, rather than for the warehouse. And, of course, the results of the 1st quarter were seriously influenced by the breakdown in planning and contract discipline. Every fifth enterprise failed to fulfill its delivery pledges, and that is the most important fact, because what we need is not growth rates in and of themselves, not the gross production, but the satisfying of the real needs of the national economy and the consumers.

The conclusion evolves from the results of the 1st quarter that it is necessary to even more rapidly and more persistently introduce the new management methods, to raise the level of that management, and to restructure all the cadres -- therein lies the key to the resolution of the vitally important national economic problems. You know that it has been deemed desirable to discuss the questions of the restructuring of economic administration at the next CPSU Central Committee plenum. The preparation for that plenum is currently proceeding at full speed. This will be the largest reform of the economic mechanism in the many decades of socialist building.

As you know, a plenum of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee was held yesterday. In conformity with the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum, there was a thorough consideration and evaluation of the rate of the restructuring in the republic, the rates of socioeconomic development, and questions of work with cadres. A cogent and extremely critical report was given by K.M. Bagirov. It was noted at the plenum that Azerbaijan entered the new 5-year plan with chronic diseases that the republic has not been completely able to cure. Heavy industry failed to fulfill its 5-year plan. Such priority branches as machine building, electronics, and instrument building lagged behind in their development.

The republic's petroleum industry completed the last 5-year plan with a debt of 6 million tonnes of fuel. The basic deposits have entered the final stage of operation, and yet petroleum prospecting has been lagging behind. It is understanding that, with every passing year, it is becoming more complicated to produce petroleum. At the end of the 5-year plan three-fourths of the petroleum had to be produced on the Caspian. But, comrades, there is no longer any place where it is easy to get petroleum. Nature does not want to restructure itself, and it will not do so, and consequently we ourselves must restructure ourselves.

From year to year the republic has not fulfilled assignments for the introduction of the achievements of science and technology. Incidentally, it was necessary to mention that fact as long ago as July 1985 at a meeting of the party and economic aktiv. But the situation has not been improving. Apparently, you have not yet overcome your inability to evaluate scientific-technical progress properly.

The state acceptance that was introduced this year at a group of industrial enterprises in our country has shown that it is by no means everyone who can pass the examination to maintain the honor of the plant's trade mark. In our republic every fourth enterprise during the past year failed to cope with the plan for production of output with the highest category of quality. Yet quality is not an economic, but also a moral concept. It best characterizes people's attitude toward their job, the work being performed by the collective, and the role of the party organization.

Or take such a qualitative factor in production as the coefficient of the equipment shift operation. In the republic's pledges for 1986 it was proposed to raise that coefficient in machine building to 1.55, but as of today that goal has not been reached. Many enterprises continue to work a single shift, and in a number of branches the return on investments has been falling.

An alarming situation has also developed in the agro-industrial complex, the share of which is almost 40 percent of the republic's gross product. The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat recently censured the work of developing the base for processing and storing output in the agro-industrial complex of Azerbaijan SSR and evaluated it as being unsatisfactory. The development of the food industry and its raw-materials base has been seriously harmed by the orientation of the one-sided expansion of viticulture. Seventy percent of the volume of capital investments in the food industry were allocated for the development of viticulture. To be perfectly frank, in the past the indicators of Azerbaijan's economy were lavishly "diluted" by hundred of millions of liters of easily sold output of viticulture. At the end of the 5-year plan, almost every fifth ruble in the republic's industrial production was earned in wine production.

That course led to a sharp lagging behind in those areas in the food industry which should support the public's needs to the greatest degree. The situation got to such a point that, judged on the basis of the consumption level of vegetables, potatoes, and even fruits, Azerbaijan occupies one of the last places among the union republics. Yet you have the most favorable conditions for growing them. The currently existing vegetable storage facilities provide for only half the need for them. It is not accidental that at the beginning of the year in the Baku markets the price of meat was 3 times higher, and the price of potatoes and cabbage was 5-7 times higher than the state price.

Azerbaijan SSR continues to occupy one of the last places among the other union republics regarding many indicators of productivity in animal husbandry. The average milk yield is 77 percent of the average nationwide level. The weak fodder base for many years has been the chief factor restraining the development of animal husbandry. The republic receives an annual, practically unchanged, subsidy of meat, milk, and eggs from the nationwide fund. More milk is shipped into the republic than is produced here.

Today we visited a commercial dairy farm where the average annual milk yields exceed 3,000 kilograms. If the entire republic could pull itself up to that level, the problem would be resolved, because the inhabitants of Azerbaijan have an acute need of dairy products. In Baku, for example, it is difficult to buy them during the nighttime.

The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee has made the correct conclusions from the criticism -- in March, at a plenum of the Central Committee, the decision was adopted to make a fundamental change in the structural policy in the agro-industrial complex, and to accelerate the development of a base for processing and storing agricultural output.

It is necessary to treat the topic of the quality of the consumer goods separately. Last year there was a worsening of the quality of leather shoes and of cotton, woolen, and silk fabrics. Every third article in that branch is rejected. This rejection rate is 3-4 times higher than the average for the country as a whole. The trade system is literally choking in this flood of defective goods: of the unsaleable commodities that have accumulated in its warehouses, 40 percent is articles produced by the republic's light industry.

There has been an unjustified orientation toward shipping in consumer goods from other parts of the country. There has been a reduction in the production of articles intended for cultural, everyday, and household purposes, fabrics, clothing, and footwear, and there has been only half-fulfillment of the assignment for the production of local building materials, under conditions of an acute shortage of them.

Nor has the services sphere been coping yet with its tasks. The volume of services per inhabitant is only two-thirds of the volume for the country as a whole. In rural areas the volume of services is two-fifths of what it is in the city. On more than 200 kolkhozes and sovkhoses there are no personal-services enterprises at all. At the same time the state capital investments for developing a base for the trade and personal services have been used insufficiently.

What, then, is the way out of the situation regarding providing the public consumer goods and services? This was discussed at an Azerbaijan CP Central Committee plenum. Therefore I shall limit myself to discussing just one aspect of it.

With a consideration of the local conditions and the public's needs, it should be possible to develop in the republic, both in public nutrition and in personal services, a broad network of cooperatives as an important bulwark, and also to use the form of individual labor activity. One can cite the experience of the socialist countries. In Hungary, East Germany, and Poland, cooperatives and craftsmen perform up to two-thirds of the total number of personal services -- the repairing of apartments and household appliances, the manufacture of furniture, the sewing of clothing, the making of shoes -- and I must say that the level and efficiency of personal services in these countries are rather high. What, then, is preventing us from following this path?

On Friday I had the opportunity to become acquainted with the work of a cooperative that produces finishing materials in Leninskiy Rayon in Baku. I was reconvinced that this is valuable work that is needed by people and that is profitable to the country. Moreover, the cooperative members themselves will not be harmed if the situation is well organized.

It is necessary to overcome the caution and distrust of these forms of management, as a result of the fear that private practice will begin to flourish here. If it comes down to that, that practice is already flourishing in a few places, but in "underground" form, under the cover of state organizations, wherever a shortage continues to exist.

Of course, one should not simplify the difficulties of administering this sphere. It will involve a considerable number of things to worry about, primarily for the local soviets. But the principle "it won't come to any good" does not conform to the bold party line that is aimed at restructuring.

Obviously, this work must be combined with an implacable struggle against any extraction of unearned income. Recently in your republic there has been a noticeable intensification of the struggle against encroachments upon the nation's wealth, against bribery, corruption, overpricing, and other unearned income. But I want to say that the CPSU Central Committee continues to receive considerable crude abuses in trade, public health, and educational institutions, concerning various kinds of extortion, as well as complaints concerning the inaction of the local and republic agencies and persecution of persons who have voiced criticism. Many of these letters and complaints have been confirmed upon investigation.

Comrades, you cannot wait for some outsider to come in and put your republic in order. It is necessary to put into the struggle against unearned income and other unhealthy phenomena all your efforts, as well as the broadest public participation. These dishonest deeds occur within the view of people, and their perpetrators count only on our silence, in the hope that we will close our eyes to them. Deprived of the cover of silence, they disappear like ghosts that live only during the night. [paragraph continues]

More light cast on the organizers of criminal deeds, more openness, and, of course, more support given to the initiative of honest people by the party committees and the soviet agencies -- those are the things necessary to eradicate any dishonest and injustice.

Having advanced the line aimed at social justice, democracy, openness, and a serious turning point in all social spheres, the party is counting on the initiative and creativity of the Soviet citizens who have a vital self-interest in carrying out that line. We have every justification for saying that the more deeply people are aware of that time, the more strongly it wins people's hearts, the more energetically the struggle for restructuring is carried out in the country, and the more broadly the front in that struggle expands.

Comrades! The process of the fundamental renovation of society which we have begun, all our deeds, thoughts, and concerns about our country's progress, are inseparable from the tremendous amount of work being done by the Communist Party and the Soviet state on the foreign policy arena. Its chief goal is peace, disarmament, and international security. It represents the fusion together of the class interests of socialism, to which aggressive wars are organically alien, as well as our national interests -- the natural desire to create favorable foreign conditions for the country's development -- and the interests of mankind -- to channel the great achievements of science and technology toward the benefit of the human species, rather than to its self-destruction.

Realistically evaluating the situation, we cannot fail to see that the restructuring in our country began under complicated international conditions. The world, so to speak, is balancing on the Elbruses [mountain in USSR] of weapons. The arsenals of nuclear weapons are more than sufficient to destroy, many times over, every living thing. In addition, gigantic reserves of chemical weapons and other types of weapons, including conventional ones, have been created, and their destructive force has increased many times over as compared with the weaponry in the days of the Great Patriotic War.

The increase in armaments is taking on new and increasingly dangerous forms. The shifting of the arms race into space can fundamentally violate stability and cause a new upward spiral in the arms race.

The 27th CPSU Congress carefully analyzed the entire situation that has been developing in the current contradictory but simultaneously interrelated world; advanced the concept of a new way of political thinking in international affairs, a concept that evolves from the need to provide the political means for the security of every country in connection of the overall, international security; and set down the path for the building of a nuclear-free world.

A specific program, which means in the final analysis the elimination of nuclear weapons and the banning of the militarization of space, and at the same time a clear, understandable program that can be set forth literally on a single page, was presented by the Soviet Union in Reykjavik at the USSR-U.S. meeting. That meeting showed that movement toward a nuclear-free world is possible. It simultaneously revealed the obstacles on that path.

After Reykjavik the question arose of finding a lever by which it would be possible to actually begin the process of real movement -- from armaments to disarmament. This is a very difficult task, because until now, at best, everything was reduced only to arms limitation, rather than to arms reduction. But the possibility of this breakthrough was designated in the elimination of medium-range means. The Soviet Union took a bold, decisive step by taking as the basis, essentially speaking, the version that had been advanced at one time by the West for eliminating medium-range missiles from Europe, thus giving the United States itself and its allies the choice of either coming to an agreement or discrediting themselves. So, the governments in the West admit that, yes, an agreement is possible.

Of course, the struggle is continuing. The West will continue to set up all kinds of underwater reefs and road blocks in the attempt to complicate this process. But we shall continue our "peace offensive," to conduct negotiations on an honest, just basis that is open for nations. But, obviously, this will be without allowing any lessening of the security of our country and our friends, while retaining the necessary vigilance.

One of the areas in this struggle for peace is the elimination of various kinds of regional conflicts. This is all the more essential since the imperialistic forces of reaction have chosen to play a game with these conflicts by using the method of aggravating the international tension. This can also be clearly discerned in respect to the events in Afghanistan. You know the country's present government has begun carrying out a policy of national reconciliation, attempting to bring peace to its long-suffering nation. The Soviet Union has announced its intention to withdraw from Afghanistan its troops which have executed their international duty of aiding the revolutionary government. It is precisely this process of reconciliation that the imperialists are attempting to disrupt, to prevent the bloody wound of the civil war in Afghanistan from healing and to preserve a center of tension close to the Soviet borders.

In our opposition to the policy of imperialism, we rely on the mighty force of mass democratic and antiwar movements, and on our friends in the countries of the worldwide socialist system. The CPSU Congress deemed the relations with the socialist countries to be a very important trend in our foreign policy. It is more than a trend. We cannot conceive of ourselves outside the world of socialism, and close interaction with the fraternal countries.

The present period can rightfully be called a crucial one with regard to the interrelationships in the world of socialism. During the past decades socialism has become a powerful international structure with a well-extended system of interrelationships -- party, state, and social. Such multilateral organizations as the CEMA and the Warsaw Pact have formed. However, the forms and methods of cooperation which have corresponded to its period of growth as a world system do not yet correspond to present capabilities and needs, and need a kind of restructuring.

In his statement M.S. Gorbachev pointed out those principles which we consider to be of paramount importance. [paragraph continues]

In political interrelationships it is the combination of completely equal rights and, simultaneously, mutual responsibility; in economic ties, it is mutual advantage and mutual aid; in international affairs, it is the coordination of actions with the active participation and initiative of every state; and in ideology, it is the growing importance of the exchange of experience in socialist building. In the spirit of these principles we have begun the process of developing new relations with the fraternal countries.

Recently there were a number of meetings between M.S. Gorbachev and the leaders of the socialist countries. They indicate the extent to which the authority of our party and our country has grown in the socialist community, the trust and authority that our leadership enjoys among its friends, and the lively, self-interested response that was evoked by the decisions of the January plenum.

M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Czechoslovakia 2 weeks ago became, in the full sense of the word, a manifestation in favor of the further consolidation of the unity, friendship, and interaction of our parties and our nations on the basis of the ideas of restructuring, acceleration, and democracy.

Another example is the recent visit to Moscow by the First Secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and Chairman of the Polish People's Republic Council of State W. Jaruzelski. In the course of that meeting, as you know, a declaration was signed concerning the development of ideological cooperation between the two countries, which set forth the keynote principles within the framework of the overall ideas of the restructuring and acceleration of socioeconomic development.

A special place in the relations among the socialist countries is occupied by the questions of restructuring the mechanism of the socialist economic integration of the CEMA member countries, and the implementation of the Comprehensive Program for Scientific-Technical Progress Until the Year 2000. The thorough restructuring of the CEMA is being prepared, to convert it into an agency that is capable of acting effectively under the new conditions.

Recently the CPSU Central Committee and the government adopted fundamentally important decisions pertaining to the improvement of foreign economic activity. They involve the more effective use of the international division of labor. Many ministries and associations have currently been granted the right to go directly to the foreign market, and all enterprises have been granted the right to enter into direct cooperative ties with partners from the socialist countries. Joint enterprises and international associations are being created.

In foreign economic activity, Azerbaijan's participation is also supposed to increase. At present, the republic's enterprises are sending output to 80 countries throughout the world, including all the socialist countries. Moreover, Azerbaijan, which used to be an exporter of only raw material commodities, has become a major supplier of machine-building output and articles produced by the electrical-engineering, radio, and electronic industries.

But it is necessary to go even farther, and to shift the center of gravity to the development of direct ties among the associations and enterprises in the CEMA countries, including those along the line of the agro-industrial complex, and to the creation of joint enterprises and international associations.

The day before yesterday I managed to become acquainted with the organization of foreign economic ties at the Bakkonditsionner Production Association. Even there, where a certain amount of experience in cooperation has already been accumulated, it is necessary to act more boldly in deepening it and making the changeover to production cooperatives.

You have the opportunities and the right to establish ties with the socialist countries in all directions. A number of cities and rayons in the republic have been maintaining friendly ties with their sworn brothers in Bulgaria, Vietnam, Romania, and Yugoslavia. It is necessary for these ties to change from being those of a host and guest relationship, and to be put on a businesslike basis.

In a word, comrades, the Central Committee January plenum provides a powerful impetus to reforms in all areas of social life -- both in domestic life and in the area of our international relations.

In sum, I would like to call upon the republic's party, soviet, and economic organizations and the trade unions and the Komsomol to take aggressive steps to activate all the reserves for restructuring, whether they are the closest or strategic ones, whether they are major or minor. It is necessary for Soviet citizens to have a real sense of moving ahead. It is necessary to support those who actually are fighting for the restructuring, and to promote to leadership positions those people who are initiatory, intelligent, forceful ones -- those who will serve as a personal example in the restructuring. It is important to teach the cadres how to work under new conditions -- under constant public monitoring, under conditions of complete openness and genuine democracy.

As we move ahead to the 70th anniversary of the Great October, socialism is revealing its capabilities more and more completely, and is confidently building up power, and its movement is invincible. Things are always difficult for trail-blazers. But one thing is clear: the choice has been made, the course that has been worked out is the correct one, and the party will not retreat from it. What is needed now is practical deeds.

I would like, dear comrades, to wish you and all the workers of Azerbaijan SSR new success and achievements.

From the bottom of my heart I wish you a happy May Day!

I wish you a springtime mood, happiness, and prosperity!

K.M. Bagirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, was present at the meeting.

Becoming acquainted with the rayon, V.A. Medvedev visited the commercial dairy farm on the Kolkhoz imeni Azi Aslanov.

On the advanced farm, in addition to cotton-raising, animal husbandry is also developing successfully. The average annual milk yields have surpassed 3000 kg. On the farm with only 12 milkmaids, who have had 355 cows assigned to them, the brigade contract has been broadly introduced. The kolkhoz's high achievements in animal husbandry were promoted by the creation of a firmly established fodder base, and the changeover to the flow-line shop system of maintaining the livestock. The kolkhoz herd has been completely renewed by introducing highly productive breeds of animals.

In the course of discussions at the farm, the CPSU Central Committee secretary directed the attention of the rayon and farm administrators to the need for the broad dissemination of the advanced workers' experience, so that the other animal husbandrymen could pull themselves up to the level of the best ones. At the same time it was noted that, with the modern, efficient running of the farm, the milk yields can and must be higher, and this should be achieved by means of the intensification of labor, the further highly-effective development of fodder production, and the observance of technological discipline. Emphasis was made of the importance of introducing two-shift operation, to make it possible for the workers to increase their overall and professional knowledge at educational institutions, to engage more in family affairs, and to have complete recreational opportunities.

Scientific-technical complexes have become a new, modern form of combining science and production. Carrying out the work program of one of these complexes which has been given the name Tseolit, the colleagues at the NII (Scientific Research Institute) of Water Problems, under the guidance of laboratory chief, Doctor of Technical Sciences Ismail Babayev, introduced at a unique unit at the purification station at the Sabirabadskiy Group Water Main. The technological scheme proposed by Azerbaijani scientists for purifying the muddy river water, on the basis of which such units have been created and are operating outside the confines of Azerbaijan also, has been patented in a number of foreign countries.

After inspecting the station, V.A. Medvedev commented on the vital importance of the scientific innovation, which with a considerable economic benefit, is resolving a problem that is truly important to the national economy and which makes it possible to provide water reliably to the industrial and agricultural enterprises and the population of the rayon. Special attention was paid to the need to put that work on a solid industrial basis, to support the efforts of the scientists and the production specialists, to introduce the development more broadly in the republic and in the country, and to take it on a partnership basis to the countries in the socialist community.

In the city's Secondary School No 5, imeni Nizami Gyandzhevi, the CPSU Central Committee secretary met the teachers and the Young Pioneers, visited laboratory schoolrooms where technical means of instruction are used, and visited areas where the 5-year-old schoolchildren study and play. During the discussion, V.A. Medvedev inquired about the way, in the practical situation, in which the reform of the general educational and vocational school system is being carried out, and what problems arise for the teachers in the course of introducing the new requirements into the instructional educational process. It was noted that it is necessary to deepen and broaden the schoolchildren's vocational guidance, and to take more active steps to instill in them the practical work skills they will need. [paragraph continues]

Emphasis was made of the importance of improving the Russian language instruction, improving the schoolchildren's self-government, and organizing more meaningful recreational opportunities for the young people.

Flowers were placed in front of the Perpetual Flame at the monument to the fighting men who fell in the Great Patriotic War.

V.A. Medvedev was accompanied by K.M. Bagirov, First Secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee.

The problems and prospects for the development of the economy and cultural life, the more complete satisfying of the public's needs, and the increasing of responsibility for the job that has been assigned were mentioned at a meeting between V.A. Medvedev and the members of the Buro of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee.

After visiting Azerbaijan for several days, V.A. Medvedev, CPSU Central Committee secretary, departed from Baku on 27 April.

V.A. Medvedev was accompanied to the Baku airport by Comrades K.M. Bagirov, O.A. Bagirov, G.A. Gasanov, S.Ch. Kasumova, V.N. Konovalov, M.S. Mamedov, R.E. Mekhtiyev, F.E. Musayev, T.Kh. Orudzhev, A.T. Rasi-Zade, L.Kh. Rasulova, G.N. Seidov, S.B. Tatliyev, Z.M. Yusif-Zade, S.N. Alekperov, Sh.M. Aliyev, R.V. Akhundov, B.S. Kevorkov, and N.A. Mamedov.

COMPARISON: LEADERS PUNISHED FOR BAYKAL POLLUTION

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 16 May First Edition on page 1 publishes an unattributed report on the CPSU Central Committee meeting on the pollution of Lake Baykal. Comparison with the PRAVDA Second Edition version published in the 19 May Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page R 1, reveals the following additional paragraph:

Page R 3, after the concluding paragraph, the First Edition reads: ...its natural resources.

The attention of Comrade Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and of Comrade Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, is to be drawn to the fact that they bear personal responsibility for the fulfillment of environmental protection measures outlined by the decision of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers of 13 April 1987.

CSA UPDATES FARM PRODUCE PROGRESS FOR 1ST QUARTER

LD191036 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 18 May 87

[Text] The Central Board of Statistics has reported that the Soviet Union has continued increasing its farm produce. In the first 4 months of this year the farmers sold the state 11 percent more meat and 7 percent more milk. Experts believe that in the context of a rather harsh winter this is quite an achievement. They say that major supplies of fodder have to be made to keep cattle farms running normally for a long winter. Heavy government investment in farm development programs has proved effective.

IZVESTIYA EXAMINES STATUS OF FEED CROP CULTIVATION

PM211041 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 May 87 Morning Edition p 1

[Agricultural Review" by V. Gavrichkin: "Feed-Producing Fields"]

[Text] The USSR Central Statistical Administration reports that by 11 May 43.7 million hectares of spring crops or 30 percent of the planned area had been sown. Some 22.7 million hectares of grain and pulse crops (excluding corn) or 25 percent of the total had been sown.

The past week has not been favored with settled weather. It had everything: warm weather, a drop in temperature, and cold rain with snow. But time is rushing by. Farmers in the Transurals, Altay Kray, Kemerovo and Irkutsk Oblasts, and Tuva have begun work in the fields. In 1 week 17.1 million hectares of spring crops were sown -- the greatest increase so far since the sowing began. Nevertheless, the pace of the sowing is slower than last year -- the lag in the sowing of a number of crops is double or triple last year's. The late spring compressed the time available for work and the pressure of work is now extremely great.

When depicting the sowing or harvesting, we customarily talk about grain and grain crops. Less frequently do we think about row crops, potatoes, cotton, and vegetables, and it is quite rare to consider our feed-producing fields. Yet they occupy a substantial area of the plowland -- 70 million hectares -- and provide the bulk of the coarse and succulent feed crop.

But to regard those millions of hectares as the only feed-producing lands now is to underestimate other crops. This year's unusual spring provided an obvious reminder of that: Having wrecked the usual timing it forced the farmers to drastically increase their sowing of barley and corn grain -- true forage crops. Increasingly often now farms are using them to prepare grain-based haylage [zernosenazh] and so-called "kornazh" -- corn grain processed with corn cobs and stalks. The job now is to try to produce 232 million tonnes of grain despite the vagaries of the weather. I would like to point out that we need around 40 million tonnes of grain a year for food purposes. Well, if we double this figure so that we do not have wait for our grain from one harvest to the next but can have a reserve stock and can trade it (after all, we do seel grain abroad, we do not only buy it there, as has been claimed) -- what shall we do with the remaining grain? Use it to feed livestock and poultry.

There is an instant conclusion: A proportion of our grain-producing land is also forage and feed land. [paragraph continues]

It was no coincidence that when outlining measures to increase the stability of the country's grain production the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers deemed it expedient beginning this year to establish /separate/ [slantlines denote boldface as published] amounts within the state plan for purchases of grain for good and forage purposes.

This is a most important factor. Economic managers and agro-industrial committees locally have been given extensive freedom of action. There is no longer any need at all to strive for "gross output" figures for grain; accountability no longer prompts people to create an unhealthy fuss, instead they can work rationally and accept full responsibility for creating feed stocks and ensuring feed quality.

Here is another aspect of the question: We have over 290 million hectares of pasture land and 34 million hectares of natural hay-producing lands. There is an indissoluble link between the meadow and the feed-producing field.

[Text] Here is an example. Farms in Yaroslavl Oblast procure scarcely more than 1 tonne of hay per hectare from natural hayfields. The meadows there are overgrown with shrub and deciduous trees and crop cultivation work is in a very bad state. And finally, having neglected the meadows, the oblast has been forced to sow more than one-half of the plowland with grasses. Furthermore, if you take into account the fact that cereals predominate among the perennial grasses it becomes clear why the productivity per hectare of feed-producing land here is extremely low.

This problem does not affect the Yaroslavl farmers alone. The stereotyped approach in which meadows, feed crops produced on plowland, and grain crops are listed separately prevents people from seeing, understanding, and resolving the feed problem in its full dimension. As a result we seem to be producing a lot of forage. In the past 2 years we produced approximately 185 million tonnes of hay, 60 million tonnes of root crops, and over 330 million tonnes of corn silage... Yet this is only 11-12 quintals of feed units each per standard head of livestock, while on farms in Georgia, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Armenia, and Turkmenia the figure is even lower. It only needed a late spring for all this to come to light by itself: Milk yields and weight gains on hundreds of kolkhozes and sovkhozes started falling.

In the last 5-year plan, for example, 1 quintal of milk cost the country 1.5 quintals of feed units (in Uzbekistan, Turkmenia, and Azerbaijan this figure was almost double) and 1 quintal of weight gain cost 13.5 quintals of feed units, which is far higher than the norms of animal husbandry. The reason lies in the orientation toward fattening using concentrates and poor-quality feed. It also lies in the imbalance in their basic nutrients, first and foremost protein. You only have to supplement that same feed with protein additives, for instance, and their effectiveness rises 20-25 percent.

The United States resolved the protein problem by means of soybeans. Soybeans can also be cultivated in limited regions here. On-the-spot reports are encouraging. In Moldavia, the south Ukraine, and some Kazakh oblasts the creation of associations and science-and-production systems is finally producing some improvement: The cultivation technique has been refined and crop areas are increasing. But it is also obvious that the "protein question" cannot be resolved by soybeans alone.

Specialists believe that the problem can be resolved by the correct range of high-protein crops in the feed-production structure. However, the area sown to pulses and other crops which yield a good amount of protein is increasing only slowly. And rape -- a crop of truly colossal potential -- is becoming established particularly poorly.

Rape can be grown almost anywhere. A harvest averaging 20 quintals of seeds per hectare can yield 1.1-1.2 tonnes of oilseed cake containing 40 percent protein and 0.7 tonnes of high-quality oil. An intensive rape-cultivation technique has been developed in Lipetsk and Ivano-Frankovsk Oblasts on the basis of Soviet-made machinery and has been adopted by many other farms. Erucic-acid-free and low-glucosinolate [nizkoglyukozinolatnyy] strains of rape have been cultivated from which an oil can be produced which is as good as olive oil. Enough seeds have been laid in.

There would seem to be no obstacles. The USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee plan allocated 768,000 hectares for rape and winter cress this year. There were no objections to that figure in the union republics, but in the consolidated plans presented by the republic gosplans the planned area was suddenly "reduced" to 222,000 hectares. The explanation is simple: There is insufficient plowland for planting rape in the existing crop-rotation systems. So even with the experience and the seed, in short, with everything that we need, out of a total of 70 million hectares of feed-producing land we cannot find even 1 million hectares planted with this crop, which deserves far greater attention. Thus a most important program is under threat as early as spring. This cannot be allowed.

MEDIA COVERS 17-18 MAY AGRICULTURAL WORK

LD190036 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 17 to 18 May. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

17 May

Spring sowing has finished in Tambov Oblast. Grain crops have taken up 670,000 hectares. (0000)

In Arkhangelsk the sowing of crops has begun. This year it will take up an area of 100,000 hectares. (0200)

State and collective farms of Altay have finished sowing flax crops. Over 50,000 hectares are taken up by rape, planted in the central zone of the region for the first time. In Stepnaya Kalunda, nearly 100,000 hectares are taken up by sunflowers for seed. (0204)

In Moscow Oblast, 17 rayons have completed the sowing of spring grain crops. The sowing of spring rape for seed is now over, and the vegetables have been planted. (0600)

Sugar beet sowing has been completed in the farms of Kharkov Oblast. (0700)

Sugar beet sowing has been completed in Tambov Oblast. The crop occupies 118,000 hectares. (0800)

Mari ASSR -- rapeseed, a new crop here, will occupy 11,000 hectares this year. Sowing is under way. (1100)

18 May

In Tomsk Oblast grain crop sowing has begun. Gennadiy Chudnyy reports that the unusually warm weather which has set in in Siberia is drying up moisture from the ground essential for sowing.

That is why work has been organized on a round-the-clock basis. This year 600,000 hectares of Siberian land will be sown, including the grain crop area covering 360,000 hectares. (0000)

Vegetables from Uzbekistan will soon be supplied to the country's main cities -- 200,000 metric tonnes of cabbage and many other vegetables. (0000)

Grass cutting has begun in Kazakhstan. This year more than 30 million hectares are sown to grasses in the republic. (0700)

Murmansk: The border of spring sowing work has reached the shores of the Arctic Ocean with a delay of more than 10 days, as machine operators on the northernmost farms on the Kola Peninsula began sowing perennial grasses and top-dressing the fields. (0930)

Mass groat sowing has started in Belgorod Oblast where 60,000 hectares have been earmarked for buckwheat and millet. (1200)

Grain crops in Kirgizia cover more than half a million hectares. (1330)

CSA Reports

LD210117 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 20 May 87

[Text] Warm, dry weather has set in over most of the country. Taking advantage of the favorable conditions, farms are increasing the pace of the spring field work. Attention is naturally being concentrated on sowing spring crops. According to Central Statistical Administration data, as of 18 May, they occupied over 72 million hectares of fields. That is 50 percent of the planned sowing area.

Grain and pulse crops have been sown over an area of almost 40 million hectares. Corn has been sown over 8.7 million hectares, including corn for grain on over 3.5 million hectares. The sowing of industrial crops is nearing completion. Sugar beet has been planted on 95 percent of the planned area, and sunflowers for grain in 74 percent. Cotton sowing has been largely completed. Potato and vegetable growers still have much work to do.

Farms are also carrying out the sowing of feed crops. On some farms in the south of the country, the time for the first cutting has arrived. The green conveyor has started up. The freshly cut grass is immediately delivered to farms and complexes. Unfortunately, the feed harvesting machinery has not yet been put in order everywhere. In the Russian Federation, for example, 27 percent of the silage and feed harvesting combines have not been repaired, as well as 19-20 percent of the tractor-drawn mowers and rakes, and pick-up balers too. Time requires the acceleration of both sowing and repair work. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 20 May in a similar report adds that "over 6 million hectares of fields are occupied by annual grasses"]

INTENSIVE LABOR COLLECTIVES GET GOOD RESULTS

PM190909 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 May 87 Morning Edition p 2

[Interview with experimental farm director V.I. Ovsyannikov by special correspondents Yu. Prokopyev and G. Shcherbina under the rubric "Attention: Experience!": "A Link in a Vast Field: Intensive Labor Collectives Achieve High Productivity"]

[Text] Shadrinskiy Rayon, Kurgan Oblast -- When Valeriy Ivanovich Ovsyannikov was appointed director of the "Baturinskoye" experimental model farm belonging to the Kurgan Grain Farming Scientific Research Institute, he felt no particular joy: The sovkhoz's economy was run down and people had lost their sense of being true owners of the land. The new director decided to begin by reviving people's interest in grain production. There were reasons for that, of course.

Three years ago, V. Ovsyannikov, under the direction of Academician N. Krasnoshchekov of the VASKHNIL [V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences], took part in planning the intensive labor collective of the Kozhukhov brothers from the "Bolshevik" Kolkhoz in Novosibirsk Oblast's Ordynskiy Rayon, the first collective of its kind in Siberia. The main aim here is to achieve the highest possible labor productivity and to create psychologically compatible, stable, self-managing collectives capable of withstanding pressure, collectives which work on the basis of equal pay.

Last spring three minilinks consisting of three, four, and five people, the first such links in the Transurals, were created on the "Baturinskoye" farm. At the end of the year the results were summarized and they were striking. The 12 machine operators had produced output worth R1,043,000 or R87,000 each, whereas the average per farm worker was R25,000.

Where does the intensive labor collectives' strength come from? Candidate of Economic Sciences V. Ovsyannikov, director of the "Baturinskoye" experimental model farm, told your IZVESTIYA correspondents about this.

[Ovsyannikov] A study of the farmers' psychology and attitude showed convincingly the main problem was that the peasants has turned into hired workers and their age-old innate sense of being the true master on the land had been stifled. Indeed, how could it be otherwise when for decades they have been "assigned" to work, ordered about, and not been asked their opinion on anything: do this, do that, don't do that.

And when harvesting the crop in the fall they felt no concern. It did not matter to the farmer whether the harvest was large or small. As for what grew and what was sent to the state granaries, let the leadership think about that. That was the kind of "philosophy" that took shape.

[Correspondent] I am not saying that this was true of everyone. The farm was indeed supported by conscientious grain growers. Incidentally, those people were the first to support us in this new test both of ourselves and the land.

To begin, intensive labor collectives were created at three of the five sections -- Mokhovskoye, Baturinskoye, and Komsomolskoye -- those sections being headed by V. Chichulanov, N. Borovikov, and A. Poluyanov, top-quality machine operators. A very important and, perhaps, decisive factor was the principle of voluntariness in the formation of the collectives: Each machine operator was allowed to choose for himself the people he wanted to work with.

[Correspondent] It is clear how much depends on the collective's cohesion. But I think that this alone is not enough. Probably, a number of other conditions are also necessary to achieve efficient working.

[Ovsyannikov] Yes, a cohesive collective needs a precise system supporting its daily activity. People must believe that they are serious and long-term owners of the land.

The main asset which the intensive labor collectives possess is the land. We decided to assign land to them for a long period -- at least 5 years -- so that they can assimilate scientifically validated crop rotations. The collective is also allocated equipment for a long period or, to be precise, for the full depreciation period. This is all very important because it is a question of each machine operator firmly and intelligently acquiring certain knowledge and the ability to correctly judge agrotechnical methods, to apply them, and to take care of the means of production.

It was decided to allocate land to the collectives on the basis of 300-350 hectares per machine operator.

[Correspondent] Is that not rather a lot? In grain growing much depends on timing -- not only must all the work be carried out to a high quality but also by the best agrotechnical deadline. But with such a workload...

[Ovsyannikov] Of course the workload is considerable -- approximately three times higher than that of the best farms in our oblast. And what you say about work deadlines is correct. To ensure that the farmers can manage the full amount we try to select for cultivation by the intensive labor collectives those crops which would coincide least in terms of growing and ripening periods.

In our conditions the most suitable crops for the intensive labor collectives are annual grasses (for haylage) and spring wheat. The third crop -- barley -- was cultivated uninterruptedly in the same field but with the application of increased amounts of nitrogen and the use of pesticides. Such a range of crops enables equipment to be utilized efficiently and the sowing and harvesting to be conducted at a steady pace.

[Correspondent] Nevertheless, how do machine operators in small links manage to do all their work? For example, in spring it is necessary to prepare the soil and apply the mineral fertilizers and herbicides at the same time. And when it comes to sowing the tractor operator can scarcely manage without the sower.

[Ovsyannikov] I agree. There is indeed a need for extra manpower. But this is needed for literally just a few days. Thus the collectives themselves choose the work schedules and decide for themselves when to ask for the sower or driver and for how long. Those people are paid for their work from the collective wages fund.

In general I must say that the minicollectives show a particularly strong sense of purpose. Their self-managing status is the precise whetstone on which the peasant's creative thinking and economic thrift are honed. [paragraph continues]

The intensive labor collectives categorically reject all extraneous instruction. Professional advice or information on interesting innovations are a different matter.

[Correspondent] We have been given an interesting report. In 1986 the Baturnskoye section intensive labor link produced as much output as 27 machine operators managed at the neighboring "Put Ilich" Kolkhoz in Shadrinskiy Rayon.

[Ovsyannikov] Yes, the economists carried out that comparative analysis to show our grain growers and all the others the true reserves of productivity.

There are four men working in the Baturinskoye section link which is led by Nikolay Varsanofyevich Borovikov, a most experienced machine operator. They began working in the new way last year. They were given 1,360 hectares of land -- 340 hectares per person -- and the necessary equipment and fertilizers. In spring, no matter how strenuous things became, they made no mistakes and did everything conscientiously. Harvesting was more difficult. The grain was ripening and the rain kept on falling. But that is the strength of the small collective, that it does not take long getting started. They set to work in hardly any time at all. They harvested more than 3,000 tonnes of grain -- over 30 quintals each on average -- and 6,300 tonnes of green matter. The machine operators averaged output worth R97,000.

The two other links also achieved good results. For instance, V. Chichulanov's link produced 38.4 quintals of grain crops per hectare and A. Poluyanov's link achieved 26.9 quintals. Productivity in the intensive labor collectives was 160 percent higher than the average for our farm's machine operators and between 100 percent and 260 percent higher than in the advanced arable farming contract collectives in the oblast.

[Correspondent] One season is not a long time for an experiment. Are you confident that things will go as well in the future, too?

[Ovsyannikov] I am. Because everyone understands now that they are working their own fields which provide them with food.

[Correspondent] And how have they fared?

[Ovsyannikov] As in all contract collectives, work in the intensive labor collectives is remunerated according to end results. From April through November the machine operators were given an advance of pay. It was quite enough to meet a family budget -- R250 a month. When pay was reassessed in terms of actual output produced it transpired that the monthly wages of each machine operator in the intensive labor collective (from April through November) came to R624 while the average wages for the farm's machine operators came to R230.

Machine operators within the links divided the earnings equally among themselves. Is such wage-leveling beneficial? I believe so. In large contract subunits it does perhaps demoralize people, but in minicollectives, on the contrary, it unites them.

I believe that we have found what we were looking for. This spring not three but nine of these collectives began work in the fields. They consist of 45 machine operators who will be cultivating almost 11,000 hectares of grain and other crops. For the immediate future we estimate that the intensive labor collectives will enable us to carry out crop cultivation using just 70-80 of the most conscientious, highly skilled machine operators, endowed with a peasant's common sense and love of the land.

[Correspondent] So far we have only talked about intensive labor collectives with regard to arable farming. But surely such collectives could be created in stock raising, too, couldn't they?

[Ovsyannikov] We have already established intensive labor collectives for feed crop cultivation. But their ultimate goal is not simply feed production, it is the fattening of livestock. Some collectives will be engaged in fattening in winter only, others all the year round. But there is a common factor: They have to feed the animals using feed they have produced themselves. Consequently, their end product is meat. Calculations show that such collectives are fully capable of tackling the task of producing and selling output worth around R150,000-170,000 per machine operator each year.

We intend to make use of another innovation. VASKHNIL Academician N. Krasnoshchekov is now preparing the plan of a 200-cow dairy farm which can be serviced by 4 machine operators. We hope to implement this idea as early as next year and aim for really world-class results.

We also foresee difficulties. Above all, we believe that each leader and specialist must work on contract conditions with the intensive labor collectives. That is, they should not receive a salary but earn their own wages as part of the minicollective. This will inevitably entail fundamental changes in the existing management structure.

This year we are trying to find a form for new relations between the intensive labor collectives and the farm's engineering staff. Perhaps it will be sufficient to introduce payments by check here.

In short, these are only the first few steps. There is much undoubtedly creative work ahead. People will not allow the work that has begun to be halted in midstream.

COSMOS-1846 LAUNCHED 21 MAY, FUNCTIONING NORMALLY

LD211538 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 21 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 21 TASS -- The Soviet Union today launched the Cosmos-1846 artificial satellite of the earth.

It carries scientific equipment intended for continuing the study of the earth's natural resources in the interests of various branches of the Soviet economy and international cooperation.

The Sputnik's orbit has the following parameters: Initial period of revolution -- 89.2 minutes, maximum distance from the surface of the earth -- 314 kilometres, minimum distance -- 196 kilometres, inclination of orbit -- 82.4 degrees.

The equipment on board the Sputnik is functioning normally.

ACADEMICIAN MARCHUK DISCUSSES ROCKET ENERGIYA

LD220415 Moscow TASS in English 0150 GMT 22 May 87

[Text] Moscow May 21 TASS -- Academician Guriy Marchuk, who is president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, has granted an interview to a TASS correspondent in connection with the inaugural test launch of a new Soviet multipurpose booster rocket called Energiya.

Question: What is the role of Soviet cosmonautics in advancing the country's science, technology and economy?

Answer: Soviet cosmonautics plays a big role in expediting scientific and technological progress today. It takes advantage of achievements in key areas of research and engineering and, for its part, stimulates their development, by making exacting demands on the pace of efforts to improve the technical standards and quality of products, instruments and equipment.

Space systems have acquired growing significance as a lever for raising efficiency in many sectors of the national economy.

Space communications, television, navigational and meteorology systems, which seemed to have brought nearer the various parts of our fatherland and all other countries in the world, have firmly asserted themselves as part of our lives at work and at home.

Studies of natural resources on earth from space have become an important practical job helping in many ways to speed advances in such areas as geology, map-making, geodesy, forestry, fisheries, agriculture and related industries.

Since the space age was ushered in 30 years ago, Soviet cosmonautics has gone a very long way.

A successful effort has been under way to fulfil a wide-ranging scientific program for exploring outer space and celestial bodies, and satellites have been used extensively in the interest of different sectors of the national economy.

Several generations of satellites, manned orbital stations, spaceships and interplanetary probes have by now succeeded one another.

The long flights of the Soviet orbiting stations Salyut and Mir and the successful international Vega project have been given high marks by world opinion.

Question: What is the role of booster rockets in space exploration?

Answer: Systems for putting space vehicles into near-earth orbit have an important role to play in realizing a large-scale program for space exploration with peaceful aims. The principal phases in the work of exploring outer space and meeting new challenges in this area have been connected with the development of boosters and their entry in regular service.

The launch of the first satellite and the first manned flight to space, carried out with the help of the Soviet Sputnik and Vostok boosters, are historic landmarks in Soviet and world cosmonautics.

A large part of a vast program of space studies involving satellites in the Cosmos series has been implemented thanks to a cost-efficient and simple-to-service booster of the same name.

The launches of space vehicles to manned stations on crew rotation and supply missions, including flights by international crews under the intercosmos program, are done by the Soyuz carrier rocket which boasts high performance, efficiency and reliability.

The development of the heavy-lift Proton booster in 1965 has come as another important achievement in Soviet rocket building and turned over a new leaf in space exploration.

That booster has been responsible for lifting off unmanned expeditions to land on the moon, Venus and Mars and deliver lunar rock back to earth, launching communications satellites to geo-stationary orbit, and orbiting long-life space stations, including the Salyut's and the third-generation platform Mir.

The international Vega project for all-round studies of Venus and Halley's Comet has been another major accomplishment evoking an enthusiastic international response.

The new tasks of industrialization in near-earth space make significantly greater demands on space transportation systems as it has become essential to increase freight flows to space, cut net transportation costs, further increase the margin of safety, be able to bring heavy payloads back to earth, and make cosmonauts' home-coming from space more comfortable.

Question: What is the new multipurpose Energiya launch vehicle all about?

Answer: Energiya is a two-stage rocket of a "package" design, with a strap-on payload. The first stage consists of four strap-on booster engines, while the second stage is the pivot which is 60 meters tall and eight meters in diameter.

The first-stage engines are fired by an oxygen-kerosene mixture and the second-stage ones by an oxygen-hydrogen fuel.

Energiya has a launching mass of over 2,000 tons and can boost off a payload of more than 100 tons.

A multipurpose system, it can orbit either reusable spaceships or other large-sized space vehicles for research and economic purposes.

Question: What is the outlook for Energiya's use?

Answer: The commissioning of the multipurpose heavy-lift Energiya booster opens a new chapter in Soviet rocket construction and the program for space exploration with peaceful aims.

The Energiya booster rocket is the basic element of a reusable space transportation system being created in the USSR. We regard such systems as promising transportation means and study matters connected with their effective utilisation for large-scale research and for rendering outer space habitable on a systematic basis.

As is known, Soviet scientists regard manned orbital complexes as the main direction of the exploration of outer space. A wide experience in the operation of stations of Salyut series has been gained. It confirms the correctness of the chosen direction. The Mir manned complex has become a new step along this way.

The first one of five specialised modules -- the astrophysical laboratory Kvant -- is now functioning as part of the Mir complex. The development of new large orbital stations and of large-size modules for them is under way.

This is why during the development of our reusable transportation space system provision is made for a possibility of its joint operation with prospective orbital manned complexes.

The use of the multi-purpose Energiya booster rocket will enable us substantially to broaden work for the peaceful exploration of outer space, including the putting of heavy communications satellites into geostationary orbit, the launching of automatic interplanetary stations into deep space and towards the sun, the assembly of versatile orbital complexes consisting of large-size modules and structural elements, and the placement of experimental solar power plants in orbit with a wide area of solar-cell batteries for use in space production. So, a prospect opens up for the industrialisation of the near-earth space. However, we do not intend to give up reliable booster rockets which have accounted themselves well and which we shall continue to use in future as well for the transportation of cargoes into outer space.

An optimum combination of booster rockets of various classes, spaceships, inter-orbital tugs, and other space technology will make it possible to create a high-performance earth-space-earth transportation line which is an objective necessity for the further development of cosmonautics.

Question: How can you describe the level of the development of Soviet present-day space technology?

Answer: Soviet space rocket technology is developed through the labour and the exercise of the talent of our people.

Academicians S.P. Korolev, M.V. Keldysh, M.K. Yangel, V.N. Chelomey, N.A. Pilyugin and other outstanding scientists, designers, and prominent specialists in many branches of science and technology stood at the rise of our space program.

A high-powered potential of the results of the work of research and design organizations and industrial enterprises has been concentrated in cosmonautics.

Satellites of the earth, spaceships, orbital stations and interplanetary spacecraft which have been made by these collectives constitute our country's space research fleet which is being effectively used to tackle the fundamental problems of science and the national economy.

At the meeting with the working people of the town of Leninsk, Mikhail Gorbachev specially emphasized that the entire space technology beginning from the most sophisticated space launch facilities, test benches and laboratories and to high-powered booster rockets and spacecraft, their life-support systems, provided with up-to-date computing equipment -- all these are Soviet-made, and are of high quality and are manufactured at modern engineering level.

Nowadays cosmonautics can be regarded as a branch of new technology which is the example to all branches of the national economy.

This is the example which we need very much now that Soviet society has risen for the accomplishment of new tasks which cannot be solved by using old methods, the old level of knowledge and professional training.

The experience of cosmonautics is convincing and inspires confidence that it is within the power of Soviet people to accomplish the grandiose plans mapped out by our party for revolutionary reorganization.

Question: What are further plans of the Soviet space programme?

Answer: Our space programme is based upon the deep conviction that the development of large-scale international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space is the constructive alternative to the plans aimed at spreading the arms race over to outer space.

Magnitude and realistic nature are the distinguishing features of our programme. These manifest themselves in the stage-by-stage implementation of large-scale space exploration plans within specified periods of time.

The programme is intended to combine the efforts of as many countries as possible in the peaceful exploration of outer space on the basis of and with due regard for the present-day development of space technology and prospects in this field as well as the realistic requirements of the countries participating in the cooperation.

The Soviet Union intends to participate most actively in the implementation of the suggested programme at all its stages. We are prepared to exchange our achievements in space research with all countries, to launch peaceful-purpose spacecraft of other countries and of international organizations by Soviet booster rockets on mutually-beneficial terms.

Thus, the Soviet programme presupposes the use of the achievements of cosmonautics for the benefit of our country and of the whole of mankind. One should say, however, that a further trend of our space programme will be determined in many respects by the actions of the U.S. side.

The planned international space flights of Soviet cosmonauts with the citizens of Syria, Bulgaria, and France are a confirmation of the peaceful nature of our programme for the coming five-year period.

Large-scale projects include the exploration of Phobos, a satellite of Mars, and a number of other complex scientific programmes being implemented by the USSR together with socialist countries with India, Austria, Britain, The Netherlands, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, Finland and other countries, and the European Space Agency.

VII. WESTERN EUROPE DAILY REPORT

Contents unchanged

VIII. SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA DAILY
REPORT

Renamed; formerly SOUTH ASIA DAILY
REPORT; contents include:

International Affairs

Inter-African Affairs

Central Africa

Burundi

Cameroon

Central African Republic

Congo

Equatorial Guinea

Gabon

Rwanda

Sao Tome & Principe

Zaire

East Africa

Djibouti

Ethiopia

Kenya

Somalia

Tanzania

Uganda

Indian Ocean

Comoros

Madagascar

Mauritius

Seychelles

Southern Africa

Angola

Botswana

Lesotho

Malawi

Mozambique

Namibia

Republic of South Africa

Reunion

Swaziland

Zambia

Zimbabwe

Western Africa

Benin

Burkina Faso

Cape Verde Islands

The Gambia

Ghana

Guinea

Guinea-Bissau

Ivory Coast

Liberia

Mali

Niger

Nigeria

Senegal

Sierra Leone

Togo

Subscribers who wish to change their subscriptions should notify FBIS or NTIS immediately. A 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue should be expected. Full subscription information is available on the DAILY REPORT back cover.

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

This publication contains current news and commentary monitored by FBIS from foreign broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, and periodicals. Items are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign-language sources are translated by FBIS. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS. Labels such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how FBIS processed the information from the original. Names rendered phonetically or in transliteration by FBIS are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clearly heard, received, or published but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

Users of this publication may cite FBIS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying it as the secondary source. For example: "FBIS reports that Radio Moscow announced. . ." or "FBIS has monitored a broadcast from Hanoi which says. . ."

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The FBIS Daily Report is published Monday through Friday in 8 volumes: I - China, II - Eastern Europe, III - Soviet Union, IV - Asia and Pacific, V - Middle East and Africa, VI - Latin America, VII - Western Europe, and VIII - South Asia.

U.S. Government officials may obtain subscriptions to the Daily Reports at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. DOD consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.) For additional information or assistance call FBIS, (703) 527-2368, or write P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013.

The public may subscribe to either a hardcover or microfiche version of the Daily Report through the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) of the Department of Commerce (5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161).

The annual subscription fee for the hardcover version within the United States, Canada, and Mexico is \$290 for any one volume, \$380 for two volumes, \$450 for three, \$540 for four, \$625 for five, \$715 for six, \$800 for seven, and \$890 for all eight volumes. This includes the occasional supplements to the Daily Report.

In microfiche (prepared weekly) the fee is \$125 for any one volume, \$155 for two volumes, \$185 for three, \$230 for four, \$285 for five, \$340 for six, \$395 for seven, and \$450 for all eight volumes. Foreign subscriptions outside North America are available from appointed foreign dealers or from NTIS.

Back issues or single copies of the Daily Reports are not available. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue of the Daily Report. Holders of subscriptions through NTIS should forward all inquiries, remittances, or changes in subscriber information to NTIS at the address listed in paragraph 3 or call: (703) 487-4630.

The publications of the Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS), which are sometimes cited in the Daily Report, may be ordered in single copies or by subscription from NTIS. In ordering, please cite the JPRS title, number, date, and author if applicable.

Both the Daily Report and JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at public and university libraries throughout the United States.